DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 971 UD 014 097

AUTHOR	Baratz, Joan C.
TITLE	A Culturally-Based Education System for the Disadvantaged. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	15 Dec 71
GRANT	OEG-TPSU-3636-02
NOTE	91p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20
DESCRIPTORS	Cultural Awareness; Cultural Education; Cultural Factors; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational Needs; Educational Principles; *Educational Theories; *Minority Group Children; Models; Negro Education; *School Planning; Systems Approach
IDENTIFIERS	*National Institute of Education; NIE; NIE Archives

ABSTRACT

All educational and formal schooling systems are culturally based insofar as they are products of the cultures that initiate them. The question that this paper addresses itself to is the relationship of the formal schooling of disadvantaged children to their sub-cultural education. What is unique about the cultural model as it is discussed here is that we are suggesting that the United States, hithertofore defined as the melting pot par excelence, is a prime candidate for a schooling system that recognizes the retention of distinct cultural groups within its shores, and recognizes the value of these diverse cultural ways. In addition, we suggest that among the diverse subcultures that should be considered as pertinent to such a school system is the Negro American. In fact, his case is used as the prime example of this paper since he is a member of one of the larger minority groups in this country, and since if one does not make a case for his culture being distinct, he may well be excluded from a cultural model. The search for new directions in research in education is essentially motivated by the fact that our existing theoretical positions have not proven fruitful in terms of helping children from minority groups achieve in the public schools. In order to construct new theoretical bases for research possibilities it is first necessary to consider what the prevailing theoretical notions are, where they are sound, where they are inadequate, and where they must be amended and new positions put forth. (Author/JM)

ED 088971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A CULTURALLY-BASED EDUCATION SYSTEM FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Final Report

Joan C. Baratz
Education Study Center
Washington, D.C.

Contract #OEG-TPSU-3636-02
December 15, 1971

Submitted to:
Dr. Harold E. Mitzel
College of Education
Pennsylvania State University

UD 014 097

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.1.	A definition and description of the concept "culturally-based education system".....	1
1.2.	Evidence concerning the existence of the cultural alternative.....	5
1.3.	Comparison and contrast of the cultural model with an environmental or genetic model.....	7
2.1.	Comparison and contrast of this model with other alternatives such as community control.....	21
2.2.	The weaknesses in the community control model.....	24
2.3.	The meaning of educational innovation within the context of a cultural model in education.....	30b
3.1.	Research needs in order to implement a culturally based education system.....	31
3.2.	The anthropological and linguistic literature.....	31
3.2.1.	Structural descriptions.....	32
3.2.2.	Uses of the language.....	48
3.3.	Educational psychological literature.....	55
3.4.	Specific research needs.....	66
4.1	Major design factors.....	71
4.2	Policy implications: lang range goals.....	71
4.2.1	Integration.....	72
4.2.2	Intensive care	74
4.2.3	Cultural pluralism -- long range policy goals.....	75
4.2.4	Cultural pluralism -- short range policy goals....	75
5.1	Obstacles to the implementation of a culturally based school system	77
5.2	Possible plans to implement a culturally based school system.....	78
	Bibliography.....	81

A CULTURALLY-BASED EDUCATION SYSTEM FOR THE DISADVANTAGED
FINAL REPORT

Joan C. Baratz
Education Study Center
Washington, D.C.

1.1 A definition and description of the concept "culturally-based education system." All educational and formal schooling systems are culturally based in so far as they are products of the cultures that initiate them. The question that this paper shall address itself to is the relationship of the formal schooling of disadvantaged children to their sub-cultural education. The distinction between schooling and education, succinctly stated by Malinowski (1943) will be used in this paper:

> I want to start from the axiom that education is something much wider and more comprehensive than schooling. By education I mean the integral process of transmission of culture. Schooling is that somewhat restricted part of it which is professionally given by teacher to pupil, by the professional educator to those who come under his tutelage in an organized institution of learning. (Malinowski, 1943, 21)

As societies become more and more complex there tends to be a division created between education and schooling, where an institution is developed for passing on some of the necessary information for functioning in the society -- information and skills that are not usually taught at home. Historically, however, the formal institution for schooling is a product of the culture that generates it and therefore, implicitly, if not explicitly, shares the values, attitudes and expectations of the greater society of which the child is a member. Thus, in a homogeneous society schooling is in many

ways harmonious with, and an extension of his education. In a heterogeneous society, on the other hand, if the schooling that was originally generated by one segment of that society is foisted onto other elements of that society, there may be a discontinuity between the expectations, attitudes and values that are taught in the sub-section of society and the ones that are implicit and explicit in the school culture that has been imposed on that sub-section. Such a situation, which is characteristic of American schooling today, leads to failure for the minority group child in that from his educational perspective the school perspective is wrong and at times senseless; whereas, from his teacher's perspective (usually acquired in the mainstream culture) the child's failure to recognize and be motivated by the school perspective may well be viewed as evidence of some sort of pathology on the child's part. If one looks at the school system in terms of its match or mismatch with the educational perspective that the child has acquired from his sub-culture, then it is possible to view the apparent successful assimilation of hundreds of European immigrants to the "American way of life" as a reflection of the fact that the cultures from which these groups came were closer in terms of their educational perspective to that of the American school system and thus provided less discontinuity for immigrant children than that same school system did for other minority groups whose cultural roots were not European and who did not share as many of the values.

Anthropologists have long recognized that every society has a distinct set of values, customs, child rearing practices, etc.,

which are the essence of its culture. Although these same anthropologists have recognized that there are many sub-cultures in the United States, little has been done to recognize this fact in the schooling of children from diverse backgrounds (other than in the "human relations-social studies" kind of unit on all the wonderful peoples who came to America and made her great). This failure has largely been due to the fact that the anthropologist, along with everybody else, bought the melting pot myth about America.

The melting pot myth posits that America is a society where peoples from diverse cultures came together and created a unique, American culture which is a product of, but distinct from, the cultures that contributed to it. American society, according to the melting pot analogy, is said to be the result of the blending of the best elements of the diverse cultures while eliminating the "impurities" or weaknesses of these same cultures. As Baratz and Baratz (1969) have pointed out the assumption of the melting pot myth made discussions of cultural distinctiveness, especially as regards blacks, a very controversial topic.

> The melting pot myth not only assumed a distinct American culture derived from but not retaining various ethnic styles, but also presumed that the acculturation to the American Way occurred by virtue of one's mere residence on American soil. That is, any second generation American automatically acculturated into the mainstream of American society. From this a peculiar logic evolved which assumed that to speak of the retention of ethnic differences in behavior was to be "un-American" in so far as any such discussion would contradict the American dream. In addition, it would indicate that the "impurities" of one's distinct ethnic identity could not be eliminated simply by living in America, the melting pot. This faulty, but

> nonetheless prevalent logic, then postulates that (1) since America is indeed the melting pot, and (2) since the melting pot eliminates all cultural impurities, that (3) then the residue of distinct ethnic behavior that is retained over several generations of living in America must represent the genetic element of behavior. Since the Afro-American has been in this country since the early 17th century, this poor logic concludes that to say the Negro behaves differently from whites due to cultural retention of African patterns is comparable to calling him genetically inferior.

However, anthropologists have been re-examining the notion of the melting pot in the United States, rejecting it, and loudly and clearly supporting the notion of cultural pluralism in the United States.

When one recognizes the legitimacy of other cultures within the society--and there is a need or desire to impart knowledge to individuals that is not traditional to their culture--it becomes clear that the process of educating culturally different peoples is clearly dependent not so much on the culture of the "donor" society but on the interaction of that culture with the culture of the "receiver" society. It is necessary when creating school situations in culturally pluralistic societies, to take advantage of the education that has gone on before the child enters the school setting, and build on it, or if prior learnings are dysfunctional within the new social order, the new behaviors must be presented so that they are sensible and acceptable within the context of the sub-culture. A "culturally-based educational system for minority group children" in the U.S. would be an attempt to set up a school system, which has as its goal the preparation of the child for

entry into the mainstream culture, while it accepts, appreciates and uses his sub-culture to teach him the mainstream skills. The goal for such a school system is to produce bi-cultural children.

Although we have been discussing the concept of a bi-cultural school system in regard to the education and schooling of minority group children in the United States it is important to understand that a shift toward this concept involves not just a recognition of the minority group culture and an understanding of where the mainstream and the sub-cultures are in harmony and where they are in conflict. There is also another sub-culture, that of the school, which in a society such as ours must be reckoned with if any meaningful change is to take place. As Sarason (1969) has poignantly demonstrated, without any recognition of the school culture, any attempts to introduce change into it will result in failure -- or as his motto goes -- "the more things change, the more they remain the same." Just as not recognizing the sub-culture in introducing the mainstream culture produces failure in the children involved, not recognizing the school culture in introducing the sub-culture will produce the same result.

1.2. Evidence concerning the existence of the cultural alternative. The fact that education and schooling are related to culture is so obvious as to be essentially meaningless. No one would argue that the education of an Eskimo or a Yeshiva bucha is not related to the cultures from which they come. In addition, no one would argue that the setting up of formal schooling within the nations

where Eskimos and orthodox Jews live is not affected by political, as well as, cultural considerations. Ideally, the political considerations, however, involve (at least should involve) the setting of the goals of the school system -- its eventual end-product. Once the goals have been articulated -- i.e. that there will be universal education; that that universal education will insure that all members of the society, regardless of race, religion or ethnic origin will have the skills necessary to compete in the mainstream -- then the cultural factors of the various races, religious sects and ethnic groups must be taken into consideration when attempting to achieve the national goal.

Anthropologists have been arguing for years that the home culture must be taken into consideration when introducing a school culture in societies that have not had such formal institutions, or where the school culture has as its goal the inculcation of life styles radically different from those that the sub-cultural children bring to the classroom. UNESCO studies have over and over again documented the need for considering the vernacular culture when introducing educational systems that have as their goal the inculcation of a different national culture. No educator in the United States would deny this, what is unique about the cultural model as it is being discussed here is that we are suggesting that the United States, hithertofore defined as the melting pot par excelence, is a prime candidate for a school system that recognizes the retention of distinct cultural groups within its shores, and recognizes the value of these diverse cultural ways.

In addition, we are suggesting that among the diverse subcultures that should be considered as pertinent to such a school system is the Negro-American. It is particularly important that he be included in any such discussions of cultural difference; in fact, his case shall be used as the prime example of this paper since he is a member of one of the larger minority groups in this country, and since if one does not make a case for his culture as distinct he may well be excluded from a cultural model because there is a tendency on the part of social science to think of the Negro-American as the prime example of a minority group that has lost its distinct cultural identity, because he has no flag orientation to refer back to (as, for example, do the Spanish-Americans) nor is his culture indigenous to these shores (as is the Indian). For this reason, this paper will focus mainly on blacks as the example with the idea that if one recognizes the relevance of the model for blacks, the relevance for other minority groups will be obvious.

1.3. Comparison and contrast of the cultural model with an environmental or genetic model.

The search for new directions in research in education is essentially motivated by the fact that our existing theoretical positions have not proven fruitful in terms of helping children from minority groups achieve in the public schools. In order to construct new theoretical bases for research possibilities it is first necessary to consider what the prevailing theoretical notions are, where they

are sound, where they are inadequate and where they must be amended, and new positions put forth.

The old nature-nurture discussions in the psychological literature have provided the field of education with two models to describe behavior: 1) the genetic model which assumes that behavior is largely determined by basic genetic potential and only minimally affected by environment, and 2) the environmental model which assumes that behavior is largely determined by one's early life experience. The genetic model postulates that various groups of people have different genetic pools which determine the behavioral potential of the group. The environmental model, on the other hand, postulates that all groups of people have the same genetic potential in regard to any human behavior and that the environment determines to what extent different groups of people behave similarly.

Although the genetic model presently has few adherents in the field of education, it has most recently been espoused by Arthur Jensen in his Harvard Educational Review article (1969), "How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement?" Jensen's thesis, subject to much criticism, is as follows:

1. We have data which indicate that Negroes score lower than whites on IQ measurements.

2. We have data which indicate that there is an important genetic element which contributes to intelligence.

3. We have data to indicate that there are genetic differences between most Negroes and whites -- hair texture, skin color, etc.

4. We, therefore, postulate that research will reveal genetic differences in intellectual potential between Negroes and whites which would explain the differences in scores of whites and Negroes on IQ tests.

Since genetic factors are essentially immutable and not maleable under differing social conditions (a white person may acquire a "tan" when he works in the sun, but he will not turn black, nor will he produce black skinned children: similarly, a black man may work in the Arctic Circle all his life, but he will not turn white; nor will he produce white offspring), Jensen would no doubt feel that the current disproportionate failure of Negro children in the nation's schools is in large part the result of the schools' failure to recognize the Negro child's unique problem -- a genetic endowment which allows him to excel in associative learning while causing him great difficulty with cognitive, abstract learning. The schools' failure, Jensen would no doubt feel, handicaps the Negro child because it demands that he perform school tasks which are, for him, overly abstract since they are beyond his inherited intellectual potentials. Thus, Jensen would say that the school needs to restructure its curriculum to take advantage of the fact that the black child does better on associative learning tasks than on those requiring abstract reasoning. He would feel that if we could set goals that were appropriate to the Negro child's alleged lower intellectual potential and construct a curriculum with this in view, then we would not

have such a great failure rate, or so much frustration.

The environmental model, on the other hand, is one that most educators and psychologists adhere to. Indeed, it is the rationale of the environmentalist that has been used so doggedly for the past decade in setting educational policy and in creating the intense interest in early childhood "intervention" programs for the disadvantaged. The rationale of the environmental model is as follows:

1. We have data to indicate that Negroes score lower than whites on IQ measurements.
2. We have data to indicate that early childhood experience (severe deprivation) influences cognitive development.
3. We have data to indicate that most Negroes are more deprived than whites.
4. We, therefore, postulate that the deprivation of Negroes explains their poorer performance on IQ tests as compared to whites.

Since environmental factors (unlike genetic potential) are highly maleable, environmental psychologists feel one need only intervene in the child's personal history in his early life so as to prevent the deprivation which might cognitively impair the child for life. Interventionists, then, like Deutsch, Schaefer, Caldwell and the like, believe that the differences in performance between blacks and whites reflect the different "life chance" they have had rather than any actual genetic difference. They would feel that society must equalize the life chance of these disadvantaged children early in life so that when they come to school they will be

"just like everybody else" (or as near so as is possible). Optimally, the school should not be able to distinguish the originally disadvantaged child from any other student, and therefore, if the early interventionists are successful, they should not need any special school goal or curriculum. Indeed, if they have not been fortunate enough to experience early childhood intervention, disadvantaged children, according to the environmental model, would then need a school program that centers on "enrichment" to make up for the disadvantaged child's deficits.

Although the genetic and the environmental model differ in terms of explaining and dealing with observed differences among groups of people, they share many attributes in common.

1. Both are deficit models. Although the environmental and genetic models differ radically in their rationales concerning the behavior of lower class Negroes, they both begin with the underlying premise that the behavior observed represents a pathology. (See for example, Baratz and Baratz, The History of the Denial of a Cultural Model, In, Kochman, ed., 1971). Elsewhere we have observed that the descriptions of lower class Negroes written by avowed genetic racists are remarkably similar to the descriptions of the language skills of Negro children as presented by interventionists such as Deutsch, Hunt, Englemann, Bereiter and Klaus and Gray. (See, for example, Baratz and Baratz, Early Childhood Intervention, the institutional basis of racism, Harvard Educational Review, 1970). Indeed, underlying both the genetic and the environmental model is the assumption that the behavior of Negroes is

improper, bad or wrong. Neither model presents any coherence or structure to the behavior observed. Negro behavior, be it child rearing practices, language, values, motivations, etc., is seen as deviant and subsequently, pathological.

2. Both models are normativistic. Most social scientists, no matter what their theoretical persuasion regarding why blacks and whites perform differently, do operate under the assumption expressed by Moynihan that "...there is...a generalized value system in American society against which all groups and all individuals can in some general way measure their worth." As Baratz has pointed out, such a statement

> Illustrates the social scientist's presumption that there exists across all ethnic and social class groups a uniformly accepted AMERICAN WAY TO BE ... a generalized statement of what defines a man, what is good, right, normal and worthy, that all Americans accept.

Scientists in both the genetic and environmentalist camps view behavior in the context of this "idealized norm". As a result, any behavior which diverges from the norm is viewed as a pathology. The consequence of such normativism when applied to culturally different groups -- that is, groups who do not function within the idealized norm, no matter what their verbal allegiance to it -- is disastrous. As Gordon (1969) has stated in regard to research on disadvantaged populations:

> ...investigators suffer from the tendency to view characteristics which differ from some presumed norm as negative and consider any correlation between these negative characteristics and learning dysfunction as culpable. This leads to a view of difference as some thing to overcome rather than a phenomenon with which to work. (p. 11)

3. Both models assume a point at which behavior patterns and potentials become fixed. The adherents of the genetic model assume that the most important contributions to behavior are fixed at the time of conception when the genepool establishes both biological and behavioral genetic traits. Jensen's logic concerning the immutability of genetic potential to environmental influences is particularly interesting on this point. Although he does not deny the effect of severe deprivation (institutionalization and starvation) on the developing organism, he points out that such explanations cannot readily be applied to the Negro population at large in the United States because they are not institutionalized in isolated environments, and because the evidence concerning malnutrition and hunger among the Negro population is not, he feels, sufficient enough to impair the intellectual functioning of the organism. Further, Jensen notes, the food deprivation is as bad, if not worse, among American Indians who score better than Negroes on IQ tests. In addition, Jensen dismisses the affect of social and nutritional deprivation on Negro development with the observation that Negro children quite frequently have higher developmental quotients than whites, in early infancy, and if deprivation were a factor, he feels that it would no doubt have been evident at that point.

Jensen's view of the genetic immutability of behavior has an interesting contradiction. Although he believes that the genetic potential precludes any possibility of enhancing potential behavior by manipulating the environment, he does believe that socially

negative behavioral characteristics need not inevitably appear in the bearer of such genes because "the social environment tends to discourage certain behavioral propensities when they are out of line with the values of the culture." (p. 38) If this is indeed the case, one wonders how Jensen can be sure that certain social environments (i.e. cultures) while valuing intelligence might not also tend to discourage certain behavioral propensities (i.e. reading) because they are out of line with how the culture defines intelligence. (See, for example, Labov and Cohen, (1967) on Negro adolescent values towards reading). In such a case, social scientists who value intelligence, and who define academic success as a measure of intelligence, might easily presume that the high illiteracy rates in a sub-culture were evidence of genetic inferiority when they merely reflect different orientations as to what a measure of intelligence is. The black community which is characterized by an oral tradition (as opposed to say the Jewish culture, with a long history of written tradition and emphasis on literacy) is more likely to value the "man of words" be he preacher or pimp, as an intelligent fellow than they are the bookworm who may just be perceived of as "queer".

The environmentalists, on the other hand, believe that the child's potential is not restricted at birth, but that it needs only the proper conditions in order to fluorish. However, these proper conditions must be brought to bear at the proper time -- the "critical period". Although specific ages are not mentioned,

the rationales for environmental programs reflect the belief that if the necessary environment is not presented to the child in his "formative" years, his early childhood, that intervention at a later date is to no avail, since his behavior and potential has already been fixed and cannot be effectively enhanced. Indeed, with the failure of preschool intervention programs the tendency of intervention environmentalists has been to move back earlier and earlier in the child's life (See, for example, Bettye Caldwell on this point) until we are now discussing pregnancy as the time for intervention to begin in order to produce children able to operate at their true potential.

4. Both models equate culture with environment. When the genetic model proponents and environmentalist model proponents discuss cultural factors they are generally discussing socio-economic factors such as poverty, and associated hardships such as lack of effective social services, poor schools, high crime rates, poor health, etc. Indeed, when culture, as regards distinct value systems, etc., are discussed by the environmentalists, more often than not, the view is one of a "culture of poverty" -- that is, that the severe socio-economic hardships of the minority group produce a distinct life style that is pathological because it was born out of deviant living conditions.

5. Both models observe, measure and describe the same behaviors. The environmentalists and the genetic pathologists both use standardized test measurements of IQ and achievement as a major focal point. Indeed, they both begin with the recognition that

Negroes, as compared to whites, perform less well on these measures.

6. Both models accept the same definition of IQ regarding what IQ measures. While both the environmentalist model and the genetic model adherents agree that IQ tests measure some aspect of innate potential, the environmentalists have continued to be less than sanguine about the appropriateness of these tests for minority group members. It is interesting to note here that at the same time that the environmentalists question the validity of the IQ measure, not as a measure of innate potential, but as an effective instrument for minority group children, they continue to discuss the "cognitive deficiencies" of these same children.

7. Both models postulate individual differences within groups. While the genetic model adherents and the environmentalist adherents both discuss the general pathology of the minority groups under study, they do recognize that there is a range of abilities among the individuals that comprise the group.

8. Both models use correlative data. In both the genetic model and the environmental model the "proof" of the theory lies in the fact that the observed behavior, i.e. poor performance on IQ tests, is significantly correlated to a variable said to be indicative of the model -- i.e. in the case of the environmentalists -- poor housing, low income, family disintegration, etc., and in the case of the genetic pathologists -- poor performance and Negro identity (the assumption being that members of the Negro race share some features from a distinct gene pool, even if there has been racial mixing.)

9. Both models deny ethnicity. As regards blacks, both models allow for no legitimate Afr>American culture to the extent that the adherents endorse the notion that the Afro-American lost all his distinct African culture when he came to this country because of the deliberate procedures of slave holders.

The cultural model as an alternative. The underlying assumptions of the cultural model are as follows.

1. We have data to indicate that Negroes score lower than whites on IQ measurements.

2. We have data to indicate that the IQ test is a measure of mainstream knowledge, and as such, a predictor of mainstream success.

3. We have data to indicate that Negroes in the United States have a distinct sub-culture that in many ways - including language and cognitive styles -- is different from the mainstream culture.

4. We, therefore, postulate that the different cultural systems between the mainstream and the Negro American can account for the differences observed in test performance.

The cultural model offers an alternative to the existing genetic or environmental deficit models in that it;

1. is relativistic; it assumes maximum complexity of all the parts,

2. constitutes a structural description of human behavior,

3. describes the phenomenon under study in terms of variants of behavioral universals rather than the universals themselves (intelligence then is not measured by an IQ test but defined by the members of the society in which he functions),

4. does not equate technology with civilization, and

5. does not know or make assumptions that behavior is immutable at any time in the organism's development.

Despite the fact that the environmental and the genetic models are more similar than they are different, the social science community, and society in general, has found it very comfortable to enthusiastically accept the social pathology model while vehemently

denying the legitimacy of discussion of the genetic model. The reasons for this are quite clear:

1. The social environment model fits into the American dream image that any one can make it, and we're all the same -- that is equal.

2. It explains the failure of our society to live up to its idealized image by invoking an oppression model which again insists that all people are the same and it is merely the oppression of a group of people which causes them to behave differently.

3. The implications of such a model -- we should all love each other and strive for the equality which we all inherently have and would manifest if discrimination disappeared -- can hardly be seen as capable of nefarious if put in the hands of a malevolent soul.

The genetic model is disliked precisely because it contradicts the American dream by declaring some individuals inherently different, and therefore, according to naive equalitarians, forever inferior. In addition, the genetic model

1. infers that not every American boy can dream of growing up and becoming President -- no matter how hard he tries;

2. it therefore goes against the Puritan ethic by declaring no matter how hard you try, you just can't make it,

3. it places the responsibility for lower achievement on the individual and places no responsibility on society to remedy injustices, (sins of the father...)

4. for the theologically inclined it seems to contradict the teachings of Christ that we are all God's children, we are all created in his image -- why would He create a defective man in his image?

5. and, such a model if placed in the hands of a nefarious and malevolent man could easily become dangerous -- as opponents of the genetic theory have wrily asked Shockley "How do you know that you will be on the committee that decides who is a candidate for eugenics?"

The cultural model is rejected for some of the same reasons as the genetic model, that is,

1. the equalitarian notion is perverted to confuse "sameness" for equality, thus it is considered "un-American" to speak of differences because the mere existence of differences indicates to many Americans a hierarchy where deviation from the mainstream is considered inferior,

2. the discussion of differences threatens America's national image as "the melting pot,"

3. many of the behaviors that are discussed as cultural differences, have been discussed and overgeneralized in stereotype and are therefore categorically rejected as untrue,

4. as Hannerz, the social anthropologist has suggested, some are afraid to discuss the cultural model because "they are concerned with the danger that a discussion in terms of culture might actually have negative implications in that people might come to feel that poverty and diverse social ills are somehow built into ghetto (Black) culture and therefore are the ghetto's own responsibility, not that of the outside American society.",

5. the cultural model denies the oppression model as an adequate explanation of behavior,

6. if the culture were really well known, the argument goes, a brilliant but malevolent type might come to use this information to nefarious ends -- a kind of counter-intelligence might develop and become even more repressive to minority groups,

7. there is a tendency for some members of the culture to devalue it -- ignorant about culture and cultural transmission, they wrongly feel that to talk about it just reinforces a "bad thing".

8. The inability of the society to think in anything but ethnocentric terms about behavior, thus creating a "right-wrong" view of behavior, a mythology which is not easy to slice into.

9. It would mean "re-thinking" what the "American way of life" is really all about.

2.1. Comparison and contrast of this model with other alternatives such as community control. The educational establishment in this country is in need of great change. This change involves fundamental alterations in the belief systems of educators especially as regards minority group children. This change involves not so much who makes decisions and how they are implemented, but rather what is the nature of the rationale of how children learn upon which these decisions are based. At present, the educational establishment's belief system in regard to minority group children is based on a social pathology model that views the child's failure as a result of his oppressive environment which makes him defective even before he comes to school. This environmentalist position -- educators using a sociological rather than anthropological model of environment -- precludes the recognition of culturally relevant educational innovation for minority group children because it defines their behavior as pathological due to a faulty environment, rather than as healthy due to a cultural difference.

The change that is needed, then, is one that challenges this established educational perspective and calls for replacing teacher professionalism with teacher competence -- a competence derived not only from an understanding of children and how they learn in a universal sense, but more specifically and indeed more importantly, an understanding of the cultural pluralism in the United States and the relationship of that pluralism to schooling. In short, the application of anthropological reality to education.

At the moment, however, the challenge to the education system in the United States is not to its basic competence and belief system, but rather to its structural organization. The current demand for community control (a political rather than educational innovation) is a case in point. In substituting a political change for an educational solution, one avoids the basic problem --the poverty of ideas of the educational establishment -- and at the same time, allows for a continuation of traditional ways. The same puppet, so to speak, but with someone else pulling the strings.

For the moment, however, let us look at community control -- the rationale from whence it evolved and why it is doomed to failure.

a. The evolution of the community control model. The general view of formal schooling in the United States (and indeed in most parts of the world has been one of overt manipulation of the child. As Jules Henry has written:

> The adult generally wants to do something to the child and sees education as a process through which the child should become what the adult wants him to be.
> (J. Henry, 19 , 267)

In recent years there has been a growing dissatisfaction with this approach. Holt (969), Neill (1967) and others view this manipulation as oppressive and have tended toward calling for a "humanizing" of the system by allowing the education of the child to evolve through his own perspective -- i.e. allowing him to discover what he wants and needs to know (covert manipulation). Implicit in the Holtian criticism is that in the process of "successfully" teaching

the child, i.e. teaching the basic skills, we are murdering his soul. The criticism, then, is directed not so much towards what the child knows practically, but rather what he becomes spiritually.

However, in regard to the vast majority of minority group children who are not making it through the system, the dissatisfaction with the present educational apparatus involves primary emphasis on what he doesn't know. His lack of basic skills are of chief concern.

With the continued failure of the educational system in minority group areas to turn out the kind of child that adults in the minority community want -- that is, youngsters who can read, write and negotiate in the larger mainstream culture, the question has been raised as to whether the educational power structure and the adult community members have the same end product in mind. Since the failure has been so pronounced and so evident for so long, the suggestion has been made that the illiterate, incompetent child (incompetent in terms of negotiating the mainstream culture) is indeed and in fact the kind of child the power structure wants to produce. Why else would the powers that be allow this failure to continue? From this assumption develops the notion that school failure is primarily the result of the power structure, and that a change in that structure -- that is a change in the decision making from the establishment to the community -- will necessitate a change in the end product, i.e. the competencies of the minority group child.

Thus, for example, the cry in many a minority community for "community control" derives, on the one hand, from a simplistic notion of malevolence concerning previous decision makers and, on the other, from a "racial mysticism" involving the prospective decision makers. Those in the establishment who advocate community control and parent involvement assume power and competence will come to those who are involved in the processes. (This is also an extension of the inadequate mother idea and a way of educating her.)

2.2. The weaknesses in the community control model. The "malevolence" thesis which supports the community control demand (as well as other programs that detail structural change rather than educational innovation, for example, the Clark D.C. School Plan, or the voucher system) essentially posits that educators (black and white) know how to educate poor black children but deliberately do not -- i.e., more money is spent on other schools, better teachers are assigned outside the community, etc. This positing of competence on the part of the educational establishment to educate minority group children on the basis of its demonstrated competence in educating majority group children is the pervasive weakness of the community control argument and the point that works against educational innovation. It is the denial of cultural pluralism and its relationship to education. In essence, it says find out what works well with white children and apply it with a vengeance to blacks and other minority groups -- WHITE IS RIGHT -- in capital

letters. Quite often, as with the Clark plan "what works well with white children" is defined as teacher expectation. The teachers need only to believe that these children will succeed and they will succeed. (But why the teachers feel the children won't succeed is never parsed and analyzed and applications on the bases of teacher's perceptions made to the teaching process.) Is there some kind of original sin in white teachers that makes them immediately respond to black children with lowered expectation? But what of the black teacher's similar response? Or could it be that the teachers are formulating their lower expectations in the light of actual behavior which their normativistic, social pathology orientation has caused them to label as defective and which has caused them to define the child's failure in the school, not as culture conflict, but rather as defects that are now inherent (environmentally or genetically determined) in the child. To insist to the teacher that these children are "the same as everybody else", and that her techniques for teaching them would be successful if only she got rid of her racist expectations flies in the face of her own reality which says that these children are different and that her techniques which work with other children are not successful here. Indeed, the cultural model posits, to learn "the same as everybody else" these children may have to be taught differently from other children. Unless an educational innovation with a cultural model which deals with and reorders the teacher's perception of the basis for the children's behavioral differences is introduced, a shift to community control will leave the traditional belief system and no amount of exhortation to excellence,

or change in personnel will change the educational outcome. Indeed, the only change will be that the community rather than the "education power structure" will be held responsible for the failure.

It is, however, the belief of many that the black community, by virtue of being black and experiencing black culture, will naturally introduce culturally relevant innovations into the education process. Being controlled by blacks, the system in essence can do no wrong" and will instinctively "do right" -- the racial mysticism alluded to earlier. It is the thesis of this paper that black community control will be characterized more by a resistance to culturally related educational processes than apt to demand their creation. By culturally relevant processes, I do not mean the current rage for black history curricula, or the discussion of trans-valued behaviors such as music and dance style, but rather the infusion of nitty-gritty aspects of culture -- extended family, language, learning styles, etc. -- into the <u>educational process</u>. The reasons for this resistance can be explained on the basis of the following:

1. The general belief which the blacks share with the whites that the oppressive white slave owners destroyed the Negroes culture and replaced it with white culture that was badly taught -- i.e. a black militant's challenge to a white characterized this position when he said "You took away my language and then didn't teach me how to talk English right."

2. The general conservatism in the community towards education -- the need to be the same. Myrdal states:

> Even where the Negro school exists as a separate institution it is, like other Negro institutions, patterned on the white American school model. It is different only for reasons connected with the caste situation. Even in their thinking on education, Negroes are typical, or over typical, Americans. (p. 882)

3. The shared view of the black as defective as a result of environmental deprivation and oppression. The adoption of the Engelman-Bereiter program in the much touted Community Controlled Bedford Stuyvesant area is an example of this. The Engelman-Bereiter program virtually posits that black children can't think, speak or hear!

4. The rejection of the concept of a distinct culture because it appears to reek of "un-Americanism" and because the behaviors described tend to feed into the stereotype which the community has been rejecting for years.

5. The tendency within the black community to suspect science. One feels, knows, experiences what's happening -- a culturally rooted phenomenon. This tendency towards suspicion of science has, in addition, been exacerbated by the impertinent, irrelevant research that has been carried out in recent years in the black community.

An example of suspiciousness of SCIENCE and conservatism towards education can be seen in the following document produced by the Black Lay Caucus of the District of Columbia Catholic Church in response to an attempt to introduce a project involving dialect texts into the schools:

> Since what we teach our youth is what we are going to be as people, we do strongly feel that the promulgation of theoretical "research approaches" advanced by "behavioral scientists" and "mental health experts" as solutions to the complexities of educating our children cannot be supported by concerned black parents when such programs will eventually serve as obstacles to the acquisition of basic fundamentals (the "3 R's") and standard skills.
>
> We maintain that the requirements of quality education for black children can be met if there is no difference between the education of "poor", "near-poor" or "middle class" pupils. All children can be trained and educated with the same tools as long as their cultural heritage is respected and their personal dignity and worth is cherished. Thus, we reiterate our position that emphasis on the acquisition of the fundamental tools of knowledge and practice in the skills acquired, combined with cultural reinforcement in terms of morals, values, human dignity and common heritage will produce trained and productive citizens.

6. And finally, as has been suggested by Glazer, the very intimacy of cultural differences (i.e. differences in family culture) may cause minority groups to avoid dealing with them. Indeed, to quote Glazer:

> ...if we deal with such intimate factors in public discussion we inevitably raise a powerful defensive reaction. No one -- except perhaps for Jewish novelists -- is going to accept cooly or objectively an analysis of his family structure as being damaging and defective in producing some commonly agreed on valuable object. Either it will be denied that the family is defective in this way, or it will be denied that the hitherto thought-to-be desired objective which is hampered by that family structure, is indeed desirable. (p. 190)

The history of an attempt to introduce beginning readers in dialect for black children who speak that dialect, and were attending schools with high reading failure rates, is a case in point.

The resistance in a sense followed Glazer's prediction. There was rejection of the language from all levels:

(1) It doesn't exist -- "Mrs. Baratz I had you to come here to see they is no dialect in my school."

(2) It exists as bad or broken down English forced upon the community. "Tha's slave language. We want to forget all that."

> My first language, as I learned it was slave language it was not by choice, Right! Get rid of it. Throw it away. Tell the kids, 'Hey don't speak that junk. Forget it! (Carden et al, 1970)

> [Or the black Vice President of Greyhound Bus, Joe Black] Did you know that we black people are thought to have our own language? Some of our leaders imply it when they suggest that white people must learn our language.
>
> What is our language: FOteen for fourteen! JOOly for July. DIS for this. Bread for money. Hawk for wind! I could go on. It's true that many of our people have fallen into the habit of poor diction and slang. Many are short on grammar and word usage, simply because they were not educated in the art of verbal communication. That doesn't mean they can't be. Or that they lack the ability to learn.
>
> Let me remind you that we are Americans. English is our language. There is no reason why every other ethnic group can migrate to this country and master English and we, who are born here, can not. Let me squelch for all time the myth that black people have a language all their own . The ability to learn and speak English is well within our capabilities. (Philadelphia Tribune, December 16, 1970)

The logic of Mr. Black appears to be if we recognize the existence of black speech that:

a) we infer blacks cannot learn standard English and

b) that blacks are not Americans.

(3) A third position posits the existence of the language but rejects its use in the education system:

a) some children learn despite the fact that they speak dialect -- (even if they happen to be a small percentage of the total group of children)

b) it don't belong -- school's supposed to teach standard English

c) children bi-dialectal (they all know standard English too, why they don't use it in school is not made clear)

Not only is the dialect rejected but stories that are not typical of white basal readers are rejected as reflecting poorly on the black community. Thus there was rejection of a story about a bug in a house, siblings arguing over a pair of socks, etc., but no objection to Goldilocks (even if she doesn't mind her mother, breaks and enters, steals food, etc., everyone knows she's white.)

One cannot hope for educational innovation merely by presenting structural changes in service delivery. It is the services developed that is the problem. Most of the "educational solutions" offered (such as community control, or voucher plan) are -- or can be seen as -- basically structural changes. Implicit in these solutions, of course, is the hope that the structural change will allow for the educational innovation; however, that "hope" necessarily implies that the present power structure in the school system was either unable to introduce educational change, as regards educational innovation, into the system, or resisted educational innovation vehemently. This author feels that school resistance is usually towards threats at power, re salaries, hiring, etc., not at innovation. Resistance to educational innovation is more likely in the community (i.e. parents' rejection of sex education), not the educational establishment per se. This section has attempted to discuss the difficulties of a model that relies

on community control as a force for educational changes.

2.3. The meaning of educational innovation within the context of a cultural model in education. Educational innovation meaning the introduction of a culturally-based school system does not mean the introduction of curricula that merely indicate that ethnics have achieved in non-ethnic settings -- i.e. the first Jew on the Supreme Court, the first Black to die in the Revolutionary War, etc.; nor does it mean the introduction of white basal readers that are "ethnically colored"; nor does it mean the introduction of sloganeering politicization. What it does mean is that the process of schooling minority group children in terms of acquiring the skills and ways of the mainstream will have to incorporate the vernacular cultures in such things as language usage, interaction and learning styles, and social patterns (cosmology, epistomology, etc.).

3.1. Research needs in order to implement a culturally based education system. As was mentioned earlier, this paper will use the Afro-American, and his unique culture as a basis for discussing the application of a cultural difference model to education, since Afro-Americans comprise a large minority group in this country, a minority group that has had problems in achieving within the educational system as it is presently constituted, and a group that has incorrectly been regarded (by both white and black) for some time as lacking a unique culture. A case for the distinctive black culture will be made by reviewing some of the recent work on black language skills, since language skills are central to education to the extent that one of the major goals -- and one currently not being achieved in the case of many black school children -- is that of mastery of standard English reading and writing skills, and since an examination of this literature will provide a bit of insight into the social dynamics as well as language structure of black culture. It is important of course to bear in mind that black culture is not a monolithic entity, neither are all black peoples bearers of black culture; it is rather that virtually all bearers of black culture are black -- behavior, not skin color, is the basis for assignation.

3.2. The anthropological and linguistic literature. The anthropological and linguistic literature concerning language skills of black Americans can be divided into two main categories: 1. structural descriptions of the language; and 2. uses of the language.

3.2.1. Structural descriptions.

In the early 1960's those linguists doing research on the language of blacks could be divided roughly into two categories: the dialectologists and the creolists. The dialectologist studied normal variation within the context of a single language, traditionally with emphasis on geographic variations in pronunciation and vocabulary. The creolist, on the other hand, studied the special kinds of languages and linguistic changes that result from diverse language contact. With them the emphasis is on cultural and ethnic variation in syntax. Although both the dialectologists and the creolists agreed that the language system of many blacks was distinctive from that of standard English, they disagreed as to the history and nature of the differences.

History. The dialectologists tended to see Afro-American speech as little more or less than a direct continuation of British dialect usage. McDavid (1965) who was concerned primarily with phonology and vocabulary variation suggested that the non-standard dialect of blacks was essentially the same as that of whites from similar socioeconomic and regional backgrounds. The general impression one gets from the writings of the dialectologists is that the slaves quickly lost their diverse African languages and, in order to communicate with their masters and with each other, learned the white English dialect of the period. However, due to racial isolation and the "American caste system" the subsequent language change occurred slightly differently for the blacks than for the whites in the same area -- thus accounting for the pres-

ent different distributions of non-standard variants in white and black non-standard English. It is interesting to note that the argument of the dialectologists for a white derivation of black English, and for the notion of loss of all African linguistic influence (save in Gullah, and for a few more general but quaint terms such as "yam") fits nicely into what Herskovits (1941) has termed "the myth of the Negro past" wherein it is assumed that the African lost virtually all of his African culture through separation from his homeland, and by the deliberate design of the white slaveholders. It is this notion that, under slavery the American Negro lost all of his African heritage, which has been challenged by Herskovits and by present day anthropologists.

Unlike the dialect geographers, the creolists Bailey (1965), Stewart (1967, 1968) and Dillard (1970) have argued that the non-standard English of many blacks in the United States is by no means a direct descent of British English, but rather is the product of language contact between African languages and English. To Stewart and his colleagues, phonological and lexical similarity did not constitute adequate proof of overall similarity between standard English and black dialect. The creolists had worked with language-contact situations in many parts of the world in which languages had developed which derived their vocabulary from one source but used this vocabulary in conjunction with grammatical rules which seemed either to be partly innovated or to be partly derived from some linguistic source other than that of the vocabulary. Since the language-contact situation between Africans and Europeans in the Caribbean had produced

creole forms of English and French, it seemed probable to the creolist that the plantation society in the American South should also have given rise to a creole form of English. Thus, the creolists were inclined to be suspicious of the dialectologists' assertions that black English was a British derived dialect of English, and they began to reexamine the data that the dialectologists had presented.

Initial observations of the creolists on the morphology and syntax of black English in the United States had shown that many of those features which differentiated it from white speech were similar to features of Caribbean creole English and West African pidgin English. It seemed quite probable to the creolists that the American black dialect was related in some way to these other types of distinctively black English -- possibl through descent from a common pidgin ancestor.

It is important to note here the linguists' technical meanings of the terms pidgin and creole, since these terms have incorrectly taken on a derogatory connotation when used in the mainstream in a non-technical sense. Taylor (1968) has discussed the terms pidgin and creole as follows:

> A pidgin may then be defined as a linguistic compromise that is nobody's mother tongue; and a creole as a mother tongue that began in a pidgin, and has not come to be identified with any previously existing traditional language. ...it seems obvious that the process of creolization presupposes and entails considerable enrichment and regulation of the original pidgin, whose formation for the requirements of a rapidly learnt second language necessarily involved a notable reduction of two or more speech communities' means of expression and communication. All creoles are therefore 'regular' languages in that each has its own pattern of distinctive units of sound, its own grammatical

> signs and conventions, and a vocabulary adequate for the cultural demands of its native speakers. Moreover, such languages evolve, once creolization has taken place, in much the same ways as do other idioms, and in accordance with their native speakers changing needs of communication. But they differ from language with a longer tradition in having basic grammars whose source cannot clearly be identified with that of their basic vocabularies, and in being comparatively free from such fossilized historical debris as result in our own [English] irregular noun plurals and verbal conjugations. (Taylor, 1968, 609)

A pidgin language, then, is a language that is not the native language of its speaker, but which is the product of the contact of that speaker's native language and another language (the source-language). The resulting pidgin is usually less complex morphologically than either the native or the source language, and although the vocabulary may be predominantly the source-language, the underlying syntax is very much influenced by the speaker's native language. If the pidgin then becomes the native language of a community, it becomes by definition a creole and in this process becomes morphologically more complex by taking additional features of the source-language, although it may retain structural patterns from the original native language. It is generally assumed that pidgin and creole languages are well developed languages in that they have a grammatical system and can be used for conveying abstract thought.

The creolists, with their concepts of pidgin and creole languages, came to very different conclusions about the derivation of black English and its relationship to white English in the United States than had the dialectologists. As a result of his comparative and historical research, Stewart

concluded:

> Of those Africans who fell victim to the Atlantic slave trade and were brought to the New World, many found it necessary to learn some kind of English. With very few exceptions, the form of English which they acquired was a pidginized one, and this kind of English became so well established as the principal medium of communication between Negro slaves in the British colonies that it was passed on as a creole language to succeeding generations of the New World Negroes, for whom it was their native tongue. (Stewart, 1967)

However, unlike the Caribbean case, the early creole English of the North American plantations did not remain essentially unaltered, rather, a decreolization process occured:

> After the Civil War, with the abolition of slavery, the breakdown of the plantation system, and the steady increase in education for poor as well as affluent Negroes, the older field-hand creole English began to lose many of its creole characteristics, and take on more and more of the features of the local white dialects and of the written language. (Stewart, 1967)

Later, Stewart summarized this process of decreolization in a way which bore more directly on the current relationship between non-standard black speech and non-standard white speech:

> Of the Negro slaves who constituted the field labor force on North American plantations up to the mid-nineteenth century, even many who were born in the New World spoke a variety of English which was in fact a true creole language -- differing markedly in grammatical structure from those English dialects which were brought directly from Great Britain, as well as from New World modifications of these in the mouths of descendants of the original white colonists. And, although this creole English subsequently underwent modification in the direction of the more prestigious British-derived dialects, the merging process was neither instantaneous nor uniform.

> Indeed, the nonstandard speech of present-day Negroes still seems to exhibit structural traces of a creole predecessor, and this is probably a reason why it is in some ways more deviant from standard English than is the nonstandard speech of even the most uneducated American whites. (Stewart, 1967)

The creolists concluded then, that the original pidgin English of the African slaves became a creole language when it was adopted as the native language of American born slaves, while the fact that plantation creole dialect had gone through a pidgin stage meant that the present dialect was bound to have non-European structural traces even if it no longer remained a true creole language. It is these structural traces (reflecting an earlier pidgin form) that constitute the more marked differences between white and black nonstandard dialects in the United States, and it is such differences, rather than similarities, that especially stigmatize black speech in the United States.

By the end of the 1960's a new breed of social dialectologist had entered the debate. Like the American dialectologists who had preceded them, most of these linguists were not familiar with languages other than English, but like the creolists they were more interested in syntax than in studying vocabulary and pronunciation. Known as sociolinguists, these researchers, spearheaded by Labov (1966, 1967, 1968), were primarily interested in studying language variation within a single language to observe how this variation related to social factors such as race, class, age and sex. They attempted to quantify the

various features of black nonstandard English, and thereby to ascertain the extent of its existence. Because they entered the debate ostensibly as an objective third party that would see, through quantitative analysis, whether the black dialect really existed as a distinct dialect apart from other white nonstandard dialects, these sociologists professed to be only peripherally concerned with its history. However, they soon realized that they could not easily avoid the issue of the history of the dialect. By the 1970's most of these linguists had come to conclude with the creolists, albeit reluctantly, that black nonstandard English had a radically different history from that of white nonstandard English. However, they still felt that the assessment of this different history was less important than an assessment of the current relationship of black nonstandard speech to other white nonstandard dialects and standard English.

Linguistic description. With the growing recognition of the existence of a distinct language system spoken by many blacks, a series of studies have proliferated that were designed to analyze and describe the linguistic structure of what has variously been called, Negro nonstandard English, black dialect, Afro-American English, Merican, and black English. The linguistic description of black English derives from varied sources ranging from data of participant observers overhearing conversations in bars and bus stations (Dillard, 1967) to data gathered under quite rigorous experimental conditions (Baratz, 1969; Garvey and McFarland, 1968). A large portion of the descriptive data comes from three sources: 1. the Washington, D.C. Urban Language Study; 2. the New York

City Columbia University Study; and 3. the Detroit Language Study. The Urban Language data are the most diverse. Some of the analyses were made from conversations overheard on the street (Dillard, 1968); others from interviews (Loman, 1968); or from in-depth analysis of a single speaker (Loflin, 1967). Still others were made from recordings of children playing in structured and semi-structured settings (Wolfram, 1970 and Fasold, 1969). The New York City data of Labov et al (1968) consist mainly of tapes of adolescent gang members in structured and semi-structured settings. The Detroit data consist of interviews with fifth and sixth graders, teens and adults from four arbitrarily defined social classes (Shuy, Wolfram and Riley, 1969; Wolfram, 1970). Although there are wide discrepancies in the manner in which the data were gathered, and although, at this moment, no comprehensive description of the grammar of black dialect (or, indeed, any other English dialect -- including standard English) exists, there is a considerable amount of agreement as to the presence of certain forms in the dialect. Some of the forms of black English in the United States are shared with other non-standard white dialects of English, some of the forms are shared with other languages and with other dialects of black English and some of the forms are shared with standard English in the United States. It is the combination of all these forms into one system that constitutes black English.

Although all linguistic researchers working on black English agree that it exists as a unique system, there has been considerable debate within the linguistics discipline concerning its details, the identification of its speakers, the distribution of the dialect

among American Negroes and the effect knowledge of the different dialects has on performance in settings requiring standard English.

Part of the difficulty concerns the fact that not all linguists use the same theoretical schema or the same methodology. For example, since Dillard (1970) and Stewart (1967) stress data from literary attestations, Labov and others claim that such data, much of which was generated by individuals who were avowed racists, are not relevant to the present. However, as Stewart (1970) has demonstrated, there is surprising similarity between the plantation literature and present day inner city speech. Stewart did a comparative feature analysis of a portion of a plantation novel, Dem Good Ole Times, written by Mrs. James Dooley, the daughter of a Virginia plantation owner, and the speech of Washington, D.C., inner city youth and found them to be remarkably similar .

Perhaps even more important than whether or not certain features exist (since these challenges can, and are beginning to be met by collecting data and merely counting the occurrences and noting who said them) is the issue of what the features mean. Bailey (1965), Stewart (1967), Labov (1969), Loflin (1967), Fasold (1969) and Wolfram (1970) have all acknowledged the absence of the copula in black dialect and the use of be as distinctive; however, their interpretations of this phenomenon have not always agreed. Stewart, who was one of the first to discuss this matter, commented that there was a difference between the use of be in standard English and in the black dialect (Stewart, 1966). He felt that the zero copula as in He busy was a different verbal

construction from otherwise similar constructions with be, e.g. He be busy, the latter indicating continual action, the former indicating immediate action. He explained the absence of the copula in the sentence He busy as a structural feature that was related to a similar structural feature in other African and New World pidgins and creoles (Stewart, 1966, 1967, 1968). Labov (1969) also found that the zero copula was a feature of the dialect but he, on the other hand, attempted to explain this phenomenon not as a syntactic feature, but rather as a phonological difference involving contraction and deletion. Wolfram (1970) in examining the speech of white and black Mississippians found differences from whites, in the black Mississippians' dialect, that could not be explained adequately or efficiently with Labov's theory of contraction and deletion. The question at hand was not merely one of different interpretations of the same phenomenon -- i.e. zero copula, but rather was that phenomenon itself significantly different from standard English. The issue at this point becomes: How much of a qualitative difference makes a significant difference?

Linguists now tend to view significant differences in language as those which affect meaning. Therefore, the linguist can accept form differences in dialects without assuming that they necessarily involve syntactic or "deep" differences. The difference in grammatical forms (for example the -s marked verb in he goes versus the unmarked one in he go within a language family) are generally considered less important (superficially different) than differences in grammatical functions (e.g. different verb tenses), since the latter would necessarily involve differences in meaning. And

since dialects of a given language usually derive from a single source, most of the differences within a dialect family tend not to involve differences in grammatical meaning. Thus, dialect differences are for the most part superficial by this definition. However, as the literature on the black dialect indicates, there is growing support for the creolists' position on the derivation of this dialect. And the acceptance of black dialect as emanating from a source other than a British one weakens considerably the application to it of the view that differences between it and white non-standard speech will necessarily be superficial. As Stewart (1969c) has pointed out:

> If it is the case that the speech of American Negroes never was identical to that of American Whites, and that, in fact, the two diverge more and more as one goes back through time, then it stands to reason that the Chomskian assumption that different dialects which derive from a single source will differ primarily in trivial surface features, while possibly valid for White dialects of American English, may not necessarily apply to the differences between Negro dialects and White dialects. (Stewart, 1969c, p. 241)

However, the rejection of the relationship of the Chomskian view of dialect differences in this particular case need not result in the rejection of the application to it of generative-grammar teachings in the analysis of dialect differences. Indeed, Loflin (1967) has used the Chomskian model to present the perhaps somewhat extreme viewpoint that black English and standard English differ so dramatically in their deep structures as to warrant considering them separate languages. But Labov has criticized Loflin, not only on his interpretation of the data, but also on

the manner in which it was collected.

> We have Loflin's study based briefly on the speech of one 14 year old Negro boy who sat face to face with the interviewer (Loflin) for about a year. When read the examples of sentences judged grammatical or ungrammatical (by the informant) they bear no resemblance to the patterns that we can hear on the tapes recorded in the same research project. ...So we are dealing not with the idiolect of the investigator, but the idiolect of one isolated boy whose position in the community is uncertain. We read that sentences such as the following are ungrammatical: The dude, push from the chair, fell on the floor. Instead we should have: The dude, pushed from the chair, fell on the floor -- supposedly a statement in non-standard Negro English. Anyone who would make judgments on the grammaticality of such obviously unspeakable sentences is a very poor informant indeed. But it is not the informant but the method that is at fault. (Labov, discussion to Scott, 1969, 90)

Labov's method of analyzing Negro non-standard English is considerably different from Loflin's. Loflin is trying to construct the rules of the system by analyzing the language system of a single informant (presumed to be typical of the speech community). Labov, on the other hand, is trying to determine the variability of any given rule of the dialect within given social constraints. Thus, Loflin generates a grammar that says that invariant be operates as a distinct verb, while Labov analyzes tapes and says that invariant be occurs X% of the time in the speech of adolescent boys when they are at play, and only Y% of the time when they are in an interview situation. In order to do Labov's type of research, one must have large numbers of informants, talking under a variety of conditions. But, since Loflin is not concerned with

the number of times a form is generated by a grammatical rule (he merely is concerned with whether or not that particular rule exists as part of the speaker's grammatical competence -- a limited occurrence is as good as a large occurrence), it is difficult to see why he would need Labov's type of sample.

Loflin comes to grips with the Chomskian notion that dialects of a single language are only superficially different, examines black English, finds points at which it is radically different and thus declares that since Chomsky says dialects differ superficially, black English must therefore be a separate language. Labov, on the other hand, seems to have started with the assumptions about the structural (and unavoidably, the historical) relationships between black and white speech that implicitly classify black non-standard speech as just another kind of American English dialect. Yet, upon examining black non-standard speech himself, Labov has found "radical (i.e. grammatical) differences between it and standard English, as well as differences between it and non-standard white speech. But these findings necessarily post something of a dilemma for Labov, since he also subscribes to the Chomskian notion of dialect relationships, which holds that historically-related dialects of language ought to differ from each other in little more than linguistically-trivial ways (such as in phonology and phonologically-conditioned morphology).

Labov's attempt at coping with this problem leads him to numerous apparent self-contradictions. He resolves his dilemma definitionally by declaring all structural features occurring

in both black and white speech to be potential features of "English" in some general sense, and, therefore, present in the underlying representation of a hypothetical "pan-grammar". Therefore, black and white speech can be seen as differing not because they necessarily possess one or another set of features (since all such features have been declared "the forms of English" already) but rather, black and white speech are seen as differing essentially in the frequency with which specific features occur in actual speech. Thus black dialect while not having a different "deep structure" in Labov's view, nevertheless does manifest itself in a superficially different form from white dialect -- to the extent that some of these "superficial" differences involve hypothetically "common" features having a high frequency of occurrence in black dialect but virtually zero occurrence in white dialect, or vice-versa. However, Labov has not been totally consistent in this interpretation. For one thing, he has begun to deal with the probable creole influence on the dialect (thus undermining his rationale for grouping black and white English together under the Chomskian assumption of a shared historical source for dialects of a single language) and has, therefore, become inconsistent in his notion as to just how much black and white English can be treated in terms of a single grammatical model. He treats most differences in his data as "superficial", thus assigning them to a low level in a pan-dialect model, while at the same time he questions the suitability of a pan-dialect model to account for some of these differences.

Labov's hesitancy to declare "radical differences" to be real differences, and his reluctance to deal with the historical issue involved, can perhaps be understood best by examining the advantages derived from an ambiguous presentation of black dialect as the-same-as-even-if-different-from white speech. This treatment allows Labov at one and the same time to embrace Chomsky, the linguistic guru, to symbolically declare that blacks and whites are the same, and yet to declare for black awareness and black identity.

Unlike Stewart, Labov has presented quantitative data concerning several Negro non-standard features, and presented examples of many other linguistic forms that occur in the dialect, yet he, as well as the other linguists mentioned, has not answered a question that is of great importance to both psychologists and sociologists when discussing a language, that is: How many blacks actually speak this language? Since, as Labov has shown, there is considerable variability in the linguistic forms comprising the dialect, and since some of the forms may resemble standard English, the question becomes: At what point along a frequency rating either for number of nonstandard forms, or number of occurences of these forms, is it appropriate to label an individual a "black non-standard English speaker"? Stewart (1965) has previously attempted to resolve this issue by introducing the concepts of basilect and acrolect for dealing with the variability of forms in the dialect. Basilect here refers to the most nonstandard dialect form in the black community (a dialect form spolen most usually, but not exclusively, by young children), while acrolect is roughly equivalent

proper" English. According to Stewart:

> In between basilect and acrolect there are a number of other dialect strata, and it is in this middle range that the dialect behavior of the majority of adult...Negroes belongs. (Stewart 1965, 16)

Despite the lack of unanimity concerning the issue as to who is to be classified as a dialect speaker, there is considerable agreement and description of the linguistic forms that are found to be characteristic of black non-standard English. This is so, even though some linguists attribute these forms to differences in grammatical structure between black English and standard English, while others attribute these same forms to differences in phonology.

Table 1 and 2 present a simplified summary of some of the phonological and grammatical differences of Black non standard English.

Insert Tables 1 and 2 here

The above tables (by no means complete) contain some of the features which characterize black non-standard English to the extent that they occur in varying degrees (depending on speaker and style in the English of most lower-class blacks, while many of these features are almost totally absent (or have a decidedly different distribution)in the speech of even lower class Southern whites.

One may conclude the reveiw of linguistic research with the following observation: while the sociolinguists have been very active in describing the forms of black English and speculating on their relationship to pedagogy - the psycholinguist has been conspicuous for his absence form the scene.

Table 1

SOME DIFFERENCES IN THE CONSONANT DISTRIBUTION OF BLACK DIALECT AS CONTRASTED WITH STANDARD ENGLISH*

STANDARD ENGLISH	BLACK DIALECT
Plosives	
Voiced/voiceless distinction is maintained in final position.	Voiced plosives tend to devoice in final position, thus "rib" and "rip", "kid" and "kit" or "pick" and "pig" may become homonyms. Weakening of final plosive may produce homonyms such as "boot", "book" and "boo".
Nasals	
m and n occur in all positions; ng occurs in medial and final position.	Tendency for nasals to be lost in final position, and for preceding vowel to be nasalized. ng becomes n in medial and final position so that "sing" and "sin" may be homonyms.
Fricatives	
th as in "the" occurs in all positions, may be devoiced in "with".	th becomes d in initial position so that "then" and "den" are homonyms; th becomes d or v so that "other" and "udder", or "either" and "Eva" are homonyms; in final position becomes v, f or d.
th as in "thin"	may become f initially, becomes f, t, or glottal stop medially, and f or t finally.
Glides	
r occurs initially and medially between two vowels in most standard English varieties; some varieties do not have r finally or preceding a consonant.	r does not occur between two vowels so that "cat" and "carrot" may be homonyms. Nor does it appear finally or preceding a consonant, thus, "bah" and "bar", or "cot" and "cart" may be homonyms.

*after Fasold and Wolfram 1970

Table 1 continued

STANDARD ENGLISH	BLACK DIALECT
Glides l occurs initially, medially and finally.	l does not always occur in final position, thus "toll" and "toe" may be homonyms. l may not occur before t, d, or p, thus "help" and "hep", "colt" and "coat", and "cold" and "code" may be homonyms.
Initial Consonant Clusters There are 13 clusters that contain r.	The r tends to disappear after th, p., b, k, and g., thus "professor" becomes "pofessor" and "brother" becomes "bovver". The str may become skr, thus "scream" and "stream" may be homophones.
Final Consonant Clusters Final consonants can be grouped into two categories: 1. Those that occur at the end of a word, e.g. "hand", 2. Those that occur by adding the inflections for the possessive, the plural and the past, e.g. s, z, t, d.	Tendency to simplify cluster, thus, "must" and "muss", "ben" and "bend"; thus tendency to simplify clusters intersects with grammatical categories involving the past - "walk" and "walked" both become "walk", the plural, and the third person singular.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

SOME CONTRASTS IN GRAMMATICAL FORMS OF STANDARD ENGLISH AND BLACK ENGLISH*

Variable	Standard English	Black dialect
Linking verb	He is going.	He __ goin'.*
Possessive marker	John's cousin.	John_ cousin.
Plural marker	I have five cents.	I got five cent_.
Subject expression	John lives in New York.	John he live in New York.
Verb form	I drank the milk.	I drunk the milk.
Past marker	Yesterday he walked home.	Yesterday he walk_ home.
Verb agreement	He runs home.	He run_ home.
	She has a bicycle.	She have a bicycle.
Future form	I will go home.	I'ma go home.
"If" construction	I asked if he did it.	I ask did he do it.
Negation	I don't have any.	I don't got none.
	He didn't go.	He ain't go.
Indefinite article	I want an apple.	I want a apple.
Pronoun form	We have to do it.	Us got to do it.
	His book.	He book.
Preposition	He is over at his friend's house.	He over to his friend house.
	He teaches at Francis Pool.	He teach _ Francis Pool.
Be	Statement: He is here all the time.	Statement: He be here.
Do	Contradiction: No, he isn't.	Contradiction: No, he don't.
	He had left.	He done been gone.
Modals	He might go.	He might could go.
Wh question	What is it?	What it is?

*linguistic and social contexts will effect the frequency and distribution of the various forms.

In spite of the fact that research programs have proliferated around the world to study the cross-cultural aspects of child language development, there is to date not one study of language development of a black child on the order of the work of Brown and his colleagues at Harvard (Brown and Fraser, 1963; Brown, Fraser and Bellugi, 1964), Bloom (1970) at Columbia, McNeil (1970) at Michigan, or Slobin (1970) at Berkeley. Good work in this area is sorely needed, especially since a great many intervention programs are currently operating under an assumption of early childhood language deficit in lower class black children rather than an awareness of different linguistic backgrounds between these children and middle class ones.

3.2.2. Uses of the language.

The anthropologists and the linguists were not only interested in the structure of black English, but they were also concerned with the importance of language within the social context of the community. The folklorists have documented the rich oral traditions of the black community, and the significance of "the man of words" within the social dynamics of black culture.

Abrahams (1970) has written extensively on the ethnography of communication in Afro-American communities. He continually stresses the role of performance in black language usage:

> In black America, the patterns of expectation carried into a public encounter and the ways in which disruptions are handled may turn into (and be judged as) a performance. The emphasis on effective talking found throughout Afro-America, the demand for copiousness and verbal

> adaptability on the part of the speaker, the expectation that he will elicit a high degree of verbal and kinesthetic feedback from his audience (feedback that will not only permit him but urge him to continue), the license to repeat and to utilize the entire range of vocal effects, all of these traits and many more are the features of the Black English speaking system which must be considered in any discussion of the structure and maintenance of Black English. (Abrahams, 1970, 5)

Indeed, the overriding aspect of performance in black speaking style may well account for the misunderstanding and misassessment on the part of many whites when they attempt to evaluate a fiery speaker such as "Rap" Brown or Stokeley Carmichael. Whites tend to ignore the style and performance (which, in many instances, is the content for the black audience) and, instead, take the content (which may merely be a "support" for the performance) concretely -- thus, the indictment of "Rap" Brown for having said, "burn, baby, burn" in Cambridge, Maryland.

The relationship between the speaker and his audience is a crucial one within the black community. The speaker performer gets his cues to continue from his audience ("yes lawd", "right on, brother", etc.). In this regard, Abrahams has noted:

> One of the values of the black speaking community which is different from whites is the high status which is given to the performer, verbal or otherwise. Furthermore, performance is judged in terms of how well the performer elicits the participative energies of the audience, and the utilization of these high affect actions is capable of producing the desired result for the performer. Furthermore, this means that the performer (and, by extension the audience) is provided with license, thus freeing performance energies further (Abrahams, 1970, 11)

Anthropologists have identified several types of language performance that are characteristic, particularly, but not exclusively, of

THIS PAGE WAS MISSING FROM THE DOCUMENT THAT WAS
SUBMITTED TO ERIC DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE.

to in the slang terms. An example of a rap involving wit, style, hyperbole, metaphor and originality is provided by H. R. Brown (1969). In describing a rap session he commented:

> A session would start maybe by a brother saying,"Man, before you mess with me you'd rather run rabbits, eat shit and bark at the moon." Then, if he was talking to me, I'd tell him:
>
> Man, you must don't know who I am.
> I'm sweet peeter jeeter the womb beater
> The baby maker the cradle shaker
> The deerslayer the buckbinder the women finder
> Known from the Gold Coast to the rocky shores of Maine
> Rap is my name and love is my game.
> I'm the bed tucker the cock plucker the motherfucker
> The milkshaker the record breaker the population maker
> The gun-slinger the baby bringer
> The hum-dinger the pussy ringer
> The man with the terrible middle finger.
> The hard hitter the bull shitter the poly-nussy getter
> The beast from the East the Judge the sludge
> The women's pet the men's fret and the punks' pin up boy.
> They call me Rap the dicker the ass kicker
> The cherry picker the city slicker the titty licker
> And I ain't giving up nothing but bubble gum and hard times and I'm fresh out of bubble gum.
> I'm giving up wooden nickels 'cause I know they won't spend
> And I got a pocketful of splinter change.
> I'm the man who walked the water and tied the whale's tail in a knot
> Taught the little fishes how to swim
> Crossed the burning sands and shook the devil's hand
> Rode round the world on the back of a snail carrying a sack saying AIR MAIL.
> Walked 49 miles of barbwire and used a Cobra snake for a necktie
> And got a brand new house on the roadside made from a cracker's skull
> Took a hammer and nail and built the world and calls it "THE BUCKET OF BLOOD."
> Yes, I'm hemp the demp the women's pimp
> Women fight for my delight.
> I'm a bad motherfucker. Rap the rip-saw the devil's brother - in - law.
> I roam the world I'm known to wander and this .45 is where I get my thunder.
> I'm the only man in the world who knows why white milk makes yellow butter.
> I know where the lights go when you cut the switch off.
> I might not be the best in the world, but I'm in the top two and my brother's getting old.
> And ain't nothing bad 'bout you but your breath.

Rapping may be used not only for "running it down" but also for manipulating other people. Hannerz (1969) has described a form of rapping known as "jiving" or "shucking" where

> "through tall stories, feigned innocence, demeaning talk about oneself, or other misleading statements, a man may avoid undesirable consequences of his own misdemeanors. (Hannerz, 1969, 85)

An example of "jiving" is presented by C. Brown in his novel, The Lives and Loves of Mister Jive-Ass Nigger, where George, passing himself off as Byron and his friend off as Shelley, manages to talk a white man into giving them some money, which they quickly spend on potato chips and wine, by convincing the man that they are poor, and in need of breakfast.

> ...the cracker said, let me ask you boys some thin. Y'all had any breakfast?
> Breakfast? George said. We ain't had no breakfast in a long time.
> Y'all wanna stop and git some?
> We as hungry as we can be, but...
> But what, the cracker said looking over at George.
> We just don't think it right to be eating with white people and we don't want nobody forcing us to. Not even white people.
> The cracker didn't say anything. Just stared at the road.
> Y'all don't wanna eat with white people, huh, he said.
> No, we don't think it's any more right for colored to be eating with white people, George said, any more than it's right for white people to be eating with colored people.
> I swear, you boys the funniest Northern colored boys I ever met, tell you what I'm gonna do -- ...tell you what I'm gonna do. 'Fore I let you boys off, I'm gonna give you some money so you kin get a decent meal. And when you go back up North, up there in --
> Harlem, George said.
> -- When you get up there in Harlem, you'kin tell them colored people they better come back

and get something to eat.

I shor will tell'em, George said, I think I'm gonna be a writer one day and if'n I do, well, I'll just write a book about it; the name of the book'll be called, All the Starving Colored People of the North, Come Home to the South, Supper's on the Table.

Ha, ha, ha, the young cracker laughed, you shor is a smart rastle, ain't you.

What's yo' name, George said, I'll put it on the first page of the book.

My name is Jim Morgan, I got a middle name too. You better use that, 'cause they maybe some other Jim Morgans around, though maybe not in these parts, and it's Melvin. Kin you remember all that?

Let me write it down, George said. He got out a pencil and scribbled in his notebook: Jim Dumb-Ass Cracker Morgan.

You kidding about that book?

No, I ain't kidding, you'll see.

We gonna get off at the next road, Reb said weakly.

...The car pulled to the side of the road and the cracker took out two dollars from his pocket.

You boys buy some food with this money, and don't fergit me.

We won't ever fergit you, and when we get back to Harlem, I'll tell everybody about you. (28-30)

When they leave the car, George and Reb get into a discussion about jiving in which George says:

> I jive people if I don't trust them, see. I jive that motherfucker because I don't feel right with him, you dig my meaning. That white cracker ain't no friend of mine, so I jive him. (p. 31)

Throwing a good rap is essential to successful male-female relationships. "You need a good rap" was one of the most frequent responses to the following fill-in, "To get a girl you need..." A young man in the ghetto must be able to "walk his walk and talk his talk."

One upping the verbal performance of another person, especially with a witty put-down is called capping. An example of capping is the following interchange of several 10 to 12 year old boys in Washington, D.C.:

> First youngster: Hey arm, how'd you break your arm?
> Second youngster: Yeah arm, how'd you break your arm?
> Arm: [annoyed at being teased about his broken arm] Falling out of bed fucking your mother.

Kochman (1969) feels that capping usually "has the characteristics of signifying (verbal insult) but ... refers specifically to the initial "put down" phase of rapping[to a woman]." He provides the following example:

> Man: You sure got a nice box, baby.
> Woman: Fifty dollars! For fifty dollars you can have the key that opens it up.
> Man: Fifty dollars? Baby, I don't wants to buy it. I just wants to use it a while.
> (Kochman, 1969, 36)

The extent and the importance of the verbal repetoire of the black speech community is best exemplified by their own terminology for the many discrete narrative styles - louding, marking, sounding, joaning, rifting, signifying, rapping, preachifying and fussing. Although we have a considerable literature concerning these discrete forms, we do not have any studies that explore in detail the linguistic socialization of the black child.

The research on black narrative styles is still less extensive than that on black dialect structure, nonetheless, the results so far is much the same in terms of implications for the adequacy of lower class black speech. For, just as the findings on black dialect structures have indicated linguistic normalcy, so have the findings

3.3. Educational psychological literature. A review of the literature concerning language skills of black children must take cognizance of the fact that during the 1960's psychologists and linguists were both doing work on this topic but from diametrically opposed perspectives (for a further discussion of this issue see Baratz 1968, 1969 and 1971). The psychologists were assessing language development of black children with mainstream standardized test instruments (PPVT, ITPA) that used standard English as the criterion for language development. Linguists on the other hand were well aware of the fact that black children had a highly developed language system, and were involved in debates concerning its origin and nature -- indeed, no matter where the linguists stood in regard to the differences among them concerning the nature of Black non-standard English, they all agreed that black children were developing a well-formed variety of English (for a review of their various positions see Baratz 1971). The psychologists' deficit perspective concerning the language abilities of black children is beginning to be recognized as erroneous, and not consonant with the linguistic and anthropological literature (Baratz and Baratz 1968, 1970, Cole and Bruner 1971). The educational and psychological literature that purports to have demonstrated that black children are verbally deficient as compared to white children (the comparison often being made between white middle class and black lower class children -- i.e. Gerber and Hertel 1970) is generally based on test results from such standardized measures as the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test or some other

contrived task that involves knowledge of standard English. This review will not include these studies because the content of the assessment instruments is biased against non-standard Black English speakers, and because the elicitation procedures in test administration tend to further bias the performance of these children. (For further discussion see Baratz 1971).

There has been an increasing interest on the part of the psychologist, to reconcile his data with the anthropological and linguistic literature. This interest has resulted in psychological studies which attempt to deal with the dialect in language assessment. It is important to note that most of these studies deal with children who are in preschool or older. There is a lack of data on children under four years of age. Nonetheless, the literature on older children will be reviewed here briefly in that is should be apparent that if differences can be noted at age 6 or 10 the development of these differences may well be evident at a much earlier age.

One popular and economical method for assessing productive language development has been through sentence repetition. The underlying assumption involved in administering a sentence repetition test is that it assesses not simply auditory memory span but some sort of basic linguistic competence since subjects can repeat sentences considerably longer than they can sequences of nonsense syllables, words, or even nonsense imbedded in sentences. It is presumed that sentence repetition is not merely imitation but rather re-creation of the sentence.

Salzinger, Salzinger and Hobson (1967) compared black lower socio-economic status children with white middle class children on a standard English sentence repetition task. They gave the children scores for recall of entire sentences and for recall of words in sentences. They found overall that black children did significantly less well than white children. In addition, they found that lower class children unlike the middle class children showed a marked improvement in word score as compared to their syntax score.

This finding is readily understandable given the linguistic literature which indicates that many black lower class children are learning a dialect of English that differs syntactically from standard English. (Stewart 1969, Wolfram 1970, Dillard 1969, Labov al 1968I).

Garvey and McFarland (1968) constructed a standard English sentence repetition task designed to elicit 15 syntactic and morphological features of standard English. Descriptive linguistic research has indicated that these features were not always present in the speech of lower class black children. Garvey and McFarland administered their task to fifth and sixth grade middle class white and lower class black and white children in Baltimore. They found that white middle class children performed significantly different from lower class children -- both black and white -- on their ability to produce standard English forms. In addition, they found that black and white lower class children showed significantly different performances on their non-standard transpositions of standard English. This research provides confirmation of other linguistic statements that lower class whites and lower class blacks speak different varieties of non-standard English.

Baratz (1969) gave third and fifth grade black lower class inner city children, and third and fifth grade white suburban middle class children a sentence repetition task involving both standard English and black English sentences. The results indicated that white subjects were significantly better than black subjects in regard to the production of standard English features, whereas black subjects were significantly better than white subjects on the repetition of black English forms. On the basis of this research, Baratz concluded:

> The implications of this research to students of language development are very clear. If the criterion for language development is the use of a well-ordered systematic code, then the continued use of measures of language development that have standard English as the criterion of a developed form will only continue to produce the results that the Negro lower class child is delayed in language development because he has not acquired the rules that the middle class child has been able to acquire, that is his language is under-developed. Using standard English criterion for tests that ask, "How well has this child developed language?" is absurd if the primary language that the child is developing is not standard English. The question to be asked in assessing language development in these [black] children is, "Are the linguistic structures that the child uses highly ordered rules or random utterances, and how well do these utterances approximate the ordered rules of the adults in his environment?" (Baratz, 1969, 900)

Osser, Wang and Zaid (1969) administered a language test to white middle class and black lower class five year olds in order to test their imitation and comprehension abilities. They found that black children did less well than white children. However, they were aware that the imitation test material they had constructed might be biased against the dialect speaking child so they rescored

the tests correcting for those differences that they thought might have been the result of dialect interference (i.e. zero copula) and reanalyzed the data. They found that when the test was scored to account for dialect differences, blacks still did more poorly than whites, thus suggesting some more fundamental language difficulty for black children than mere "dialect interference". It is important to note that Osser et al corrected for all the features that they thought were dialect induced errors (their major source for dialect features being Loban [1966]); however, they attributed the omission of the article as "( ) boy pulled by the girl" as a language error not related to dialect. Stewart (1969) has indicated that the article is not obligatory under all circumstances in the dialect. Indeed, when Osser et al's "dialect corrected" data is re-corrected to include the non-obligatory article, the differences between the black and white groups disappear. Osser et al did anticipate this possibility when they commented that some of the differences they observed after the data were corrected for dialect "might reflect unidentified dialect variations." Osser et al were interested in comprehension of standard English as well as production. Since the comprehension task was administered only in standard English there was no possibility of correcting this task for dialect differences. The researchers found that the black lower class children did significantly less well than did whites on the standard English comprehension task.

Osser et al stressed the necessity of looking at both comprehension and production together in order to determine the child's knowledge of certain linguistic forms, since in some instances

children could repeat forms that they did not appear to comprehend and in other instances they could comprehend forms that they failed to reproduct on the imitative task.

Studies of children's language development have examined individual features of language development (i.e., control of verb inflections (Cazden, 1964), production of comparative endings, plurals, and verb inflections (Berko, 1958), etc.) as well as the overall syntactic development. Unfortunately, there is little work concerning the development of particular features in the black community per se. For example, although the use of "be" as an iterative form in black English is constantly mentioned as an example of underlying semantic differences between standard English and black English, no developmental studies examining this feature have been conducted.

Most of this excellent work on language development was conducted on small samples of white predominantly middle class children. Baratz (1966), however, did examine the productive and receptive knowledge of the plural of black lower class, as compared to white middle class, nursery school children. Using a modified version of the Berko (1958) test, she found that

> ...although the economically disadvantaged [black] child has less mastery over the middle class code [in regard to acquisition of the plural] than does his middle class agemate, the processes involved in acquiring mastery of that code, i.e. receptive and expressive control, control on the imitative versus the generative level and control of the various morphemes (/s/, /z/, /iz/) are the same for him as they are for the middle class child. (Baratz, 1966)

Baratz concluded that dialect difference could explain the quantitative difference in performance of the two groups.

Baldwin and Baldwin (1970) administered the Berko test to black lower class children in Harlem, and compared their performance to that of the original subjects (white and middle class) used by Berko. Their results were comparable to Baratz' in that they discovered that dialect difference was the major factor in accounting for the items that were not answered correctly by black children. They, too, noted that the pattern of acquisition of the various forms tested was similar for their Harlem group as compared with Berko's Harvard group.

Torrey (1969) tested 27 Harlem second graders on their receptive and expressive knowledge of the following standard English forms: 1. the plural, 2. the third person singular, 3. the possessive, and 4. the contracted "is". She found, with the criterion that the child must have used the form at least 3 out of 4 times, that productively, 26 children had control of the plural, 15 of the "is" contraction, 13 of the possessive, and only 4 of the third person singular. Receptively, 25 children understood the plural, 16 understood the third person singular, 14 the possessive and 12 the "is" contraction. Although she found that some children who did not use a form (i.e. the /s/ on duck's nurse) could generally identify the form receptively, she found that usually

> the one [form] they leave off most, the verb ending, is the one they also partially fail to understand. (Torrey, 1969)

The language development abilities of black children in regard to semantic aspects have also been assessed by examining their responses to word association tasks. Although the adequacy of word association as a tool for language development assessment has been questioned, it is still an interesting device for examining differences between groups in terms of associative networks. Entwisle (1968) compared the word association responses of black and white low socio-economic elementary school with those of white middle class children. She found that, at first grade, white slum children were more advanced in language development (that is they gave more paradigmatic responses) than suburban children with similar intelligence levels. Black inner city children scored below the white slum dwellers on paradigmatic responses, but higher than white middle class children of average and above average intelligence. By third grade there was a reverse in scores with white and black lower class city children scoring below white suburban children. By fifth grade the differences seem to have disappeared in regard to paradigmatic responses and "all children appear to attain the same asymptotic rate."

In another study that examined the range of connotations of young children, Entwisle (1969) found that there was a difference between black and white youngsters in word associations with black children giving more klang (rhyming) responses. In addition, black children were likely to give different frequent responses and a wider range of responses to a stimulus word than were white children. Biases were also indicated between the standard English of the test item and the dialect and culture of the black child.

r example, certain words were not a part of his culture, and the black child tended to give klang responses -- i.e. "beasant" for "peasant". Other dialect interference was the result of pronunciation differences between standard English and black dialect. For example, black children frequently responded "five", "money" or "dumb" to the stimulus since, and "soft", "quiet" or "loud" to the stimulus allow. These responses are not surprising considering the fact that in the dialect there is no distinction made between /i/ and /e/ preceding a nasal, and thus the child heard since as cents or sense. Similarly, in the dialect there is a tendency to drop initial unstressed vowels and to devoice the final consonants; thus in the child's dialect allow, aloud and loud are e often homonyms.

Horner (1968) attempted to examine the function of speech in a naturalistic setting. She attached wireless microphones to two three year old black children and recorded all their activities for two days -- a weekday and a weekend. She found that both children tended to talk a little more often than they were talked to, and that they tended to interact more with adults than with children. Her data indicated that verbal behavior was most likely to occur in two types of settings: 1. where transactions were being completed for specific needs -- getting an object, and 2. where the climate was emotionally charged -- a child was hurt or frustrated.

When she analyzed her data according to a Skinnerian model of verbal behavior, Horner found that mands and tacts predominated th echoic and intraverbal behavior being virtually non-existent. The absence of echoic behavior was regarded as highly interesting

in light of the fact that echoic behavior was presumed to play an important role in language development.

Although Horner found that the mother was not present a great deal of the time, she observed that when the mother was present, the child interacted with her a great deal. She was an important source of stimulation and reinforcement to them, providing them with both corrective and instructional information.

It is interesting to compare Horner's work with the findings of Baldwin and Baldwin (1967, 1968, 1970). The Baldwins were also interested in mother-child interactions, but unlike Horner they collected their data in a laboratory setting. Unlike Horner, they found that generally speaking mothers talked more than the children. They too, however, found a high incidence of mands, but interestingly enough, the mothers in the Baldwin studies appeared to be "trying to control the behavior of the child by this means [manding] much more than the child requests behavior of the mother."

The Baldwins studied white and black mother-child interactions of both middle and lower class subjects. They were able to do both longitudinal and cross-sectional studies. Although they had originally believed the deficit hypotheses concerning the verbal stimulation lower class mothers provide their children, they found that the age of the child was a much more important variable in mother-child interactions than either race or class. Their research led them to conclude that

> [there is] a very pervasive pattern of mother-child interaction in which differences between the upper-middle class family and the Harlem [lower-class] family are only minor variations

> on a theme rather than completely different tunes, and even these minor modulations are not readily translated into explanations for the Harlem child's difficulty in school or into recommendations for the most effective type of pre-school programs for children. (Baldwin and Baldwin, 1970, 3)

Although race and class did not prove to be a very significant variable concerning cognitive content of mother-child interactions, the Baldwins did find several interesting aspects concerning the language usage of mothers in general. The white and black mothers showed no significant differences in syntactic complexity when talking with an adult but they shifted their speech significantly when interacting with their children. The difference between black and white mothers in interacting with their children appeared to be more a function of interaction style than of linguistic restriction. Harlem mothers asked more questions of clarification, which involved low linguistic complexity, while white middle class mothers used more fantasy and explanation, which involved more complex linguistic patterning (as determined by their scale of linguistic complexity).

Most of the mother-child interaction studies have been conducted outside the child's normal settings (in a laboratory) and therefore, have measured contrived interactions which may well be atypical of, or represent a lop-sided view of, actual social interaction at home. Indeed, the extreme focus on mother-child interaction per se may be unjustified for cultures in which peer group influence constitutes a prime channel of socialization. (Ward 1971)

The mother-child interaction reviewed here makes it clear that although black and white mothers do not necessarily interact

in the South, much of her descriptions of attitudes towards children, socialization of children, and child rearing practices in general are similar to findings of other researchers who have worked in urban settings (Young 1969, 1971). These types of ethnographic studies of blacks especially as regards socialization of young children, are extremely scarce (black novelists and biographers -- not social scientists -- turn out to be a major source of such information at present).

2. More basic descriptive work on the language of these minority groups. This is especially true of the speech of Afro-Americans, but is also true of Spanish-Americans. One of the major difficulties of the existing bi-lingual programs for Spanish-Americans has been the failure to recognize that the Spanish these children speak is not the same dialect of Spanish as is presented in the curricula, etc.

3. More basic descriptions of cognitive styles as they relate to learning. The work of Lesser and Stodolsky (1969) is a case in point. Their laboratory work clearly indicated ethnic group differences in learning. Research must be pursued that not only describes more fully these different modes, but examines how they can be incorporated into the different teaching processes with different children. In addition, we need studies of the folk cosmology and epistomology of cultural minority groups, especially as they relate to education.

4. Tests must be developed that can assess the language abilities of children in terms of their knowledge of the vernacular

language (Tex-Mex, Black non-standard English, French creole, etc.) but also in terms of their knowledge of standard English. Such instruments are not only necessary for diagnosis and curriculum development; they are also important for any evaluation of the effectiveness of a cultural model.

5. Research must be conducted into other situations around the world where culture conflict has been recognized as a factor in education. Conferences should be held that examine such issues as teacher attitudes toward vernacular culture, culture conflict in the classroom, the role of the vernacular culture in education, etc., as they have been dealt with (successfully or unsuccessfully in other countries -- see for example the journal Comparative Education Review for its special issue discussion of such topics in relation to African Education).

6. Research on the implementation of educational innovation must be undertaken. It cannot be stressed enough that every educational effort, whether supported by administrators, professors or parents, cannot be implemented or sustained without the understanding, enthusiasm and cooperation of the educational system as an entity (administrators and teachers). Educational reform cannot be done by fiat. Research on the culture of the school system must be undertaken as well since a culturally based school system may well be in conflict with the school culture to the very extent that it is successful in alleviating the culture conflict between the child and the classroom.

7. A thorough assessment must be made of current bi-lingual and bi-cultural programs. It is especially important that evaluations be made in terms of the ways in which the program has attempted to build in a respect for, and a use of the vernacular culture in the teaching of new skills. (It has been clear that many of the "bi-lingual programs" are really not that -- i.e. the teachers for exampledo not know Spanish, to say nothing of the actual dialect spoken by the children, etc.).

8. Curricula, classroom strategies, materials, tests, etc., must be developed for use in the various culturally based schools. Particular emphasis will have to be placed on those aspects of the vernacular culture that are in conflict with the mainstream cul-ure so that bridges can be made between the two cultures that can be seen as meaningful and not merely arbitrary to the children.

9. Teacher training must be undertaken. Programs must be developed in terms of what the appropriate training shall be for a teacher who wishes to teach ethnically different children, and efforts made to see that such teachers can work within the present system. Lang (1971) gave a particularly poignant example of young Peace Corps returnees who came to Hawaii to work with minority group children, and who during the course of their teaching were able to acculturate their teaching styles to the needs of the children but who were not able to deal with the culture of the school room and so ultimately left the school system -- this time not because there was "culture shock" between the children and the teacher, but between the teacher and the school system.

10. Comparative research concerning the way in which school systems in other parts of the world have dealt with culture-conflict between the vernacular culture and the school culture.

11. In conjunction with research on the ways in which other countries have dealt with the problem of culture-conflict in education, one must also conduct research to discover how school systems implemented educational programs that were sensitive to cultural differences.

4.1. Major design factors. The introduction of the concept of cultural pluralism in the United States of America with its obvious implications for change in the nature of public schooling is relatively recent and involves fundamental changes in the process of education for minority group children. Because the concept is radical, and thus does not currently have wide public acceptance, and because our information on many aspects of cultural difference and cultural conflict is also incomplete, we are not ready at this time to launch any large scale investigations involving the creation of entire "culturally based school systems". It is necessary, however, to begin dealing with several of the aspects involved in the creation of such a culturally based system. Until the concept of cultural pluralism is recognized, any attempts at large scale implementation of a culturally based system on the order of the "voucher experiment" would be doomed to misunderstanding, controversy and failure.

4.2. Policy implications: long range goals. That black children are failing in our schools at an inordinately high rate is not a matter of dispute, it is a fact -- an embarrassing fact but not a contravertible one to the extent that no matter how diverse the explanations for the failure may be, the failure itself is not explained away. Indeed, that failure has been of major concern to policy makers, and in the past has generated two major policy orientation to combat that failure: 1. integration and 2. intensive dosages of traditional school fare.

4.2.1. Integration. The decision to solve the school failure problem by integration was initially seen by many whites and blacks as a positive step which went forward in our attempts to live up to our national idealized image as a country of equal opportunity for all where no discrimination was practiced on the basis of "race, creed or religion". Indeed, those whites who opposed such a move (saying they're not like us) were viewed as racists. The general sentiment at the time was that blacks were indeed just like whites and where this appeared not to be the case the deficit hypothesis was applied -- i.e. they have not had the opportunities because of exclusion to be the same, and thus, they are deficient -- but provide the opportunities and you'll see blacks are whites with dark skins.

But integration has not worked. In many instances it has served merely to highlight the differences between blacks and whites and, in the absence of a cultural pluralism model, intensify the overt and covert beliefs of many in the "natural inferiority" of the Negro.

The current phase of the integration policy is the bussing issue which is presently so hotly debated and which is being met with intense resistance in the North (Pontiac, Michigan for example) as well as the South. The essential element in the thrust towards integration (to be achieved if necessary through bussing) was the thought that such efforts would end the unequal distribution of goods and services to black children, and in addition, that the experience of interacting with white children and professionals would have a positive effect on the learning performance of black youngsters.

Integration, as a policy to counteract failure of blacks in our schools, has failed:

1) Whites have either moved away or set up private schools (--D.C. Public Schools, in 1954 a black and a white segregated system, 1955 the beginning of integration, 1971 97% black children and an overwhelming percent of black teachers and administrators is a case in point -- D.C. may merely be "ahead" of the rest of our nation's urban school systems.)

2) When large numbers of black children are integrated into a white system they bring their distinct culture with them, thus creating conflict between the school culture and their vernacular culture on the one hand and between their vernacular culture and the culture of the white children on the other. The culture conflict with the school (that does not recognize the existence or validity of the child's culture in the education process) leads to school failure on the part of the children and consequent educator pessimism. The teachers accustomed to educating white middle class high achieving youngsters experience these black children as different (which they equate with defective), and tend to perceive them as uneducable since their hitherto successful methods (that is whites learned with them) don't work, and thus the teacher may in many instances resegregate these children within the integrated setting. The culture conflict between white and black students leads to white panic and flight to the hinterlands.

3) In addition to the problems mentioned above, the aspect of integration that underlies the belief that black children will benefit merely from sitting with white children -- the "rub-off effect" --

is an insulting one to many black people and therefore, integration is being resisted by them.

4.2.2 Intensive care. The intensive care policy involved delivering large dosages of the traditional school room fare. This was an attempt to deal with the perceived "deficits" of black children and also to make up for past unequal delivery of services. The assumption here is that equal educational opportunity has been denied blacks because they have not gotten as much as whites (good equipment, certified teachers, new buildings, libraries, etc.) in the past, so they need more of what whites had had in the present. Since what whites had worked for them, the idea follows, with enough intensity to make up for previous deprivation, it will work for blacks. The intervention programs (the white schooling at an earlier and earlier age) can be seen as just such an attempt. The More Effective Schools in New York City is another such example.

Both these orientations, integration and intensive care - come from a deficit rather than a different perspective of the minority group child. It pities his defiencies without respecting his differences. The child is seen as having been deprived of things and thereforenot well developed. There is no recognition that the integrity of who he is now may influence -- indeed, conflict with -- what it is the school wishes him to become. Until the potential conflict between the vernacular culture and the school culture is acknowledged and dealt with as part of the educational process, black children, as well as other minority group children, are doomed, in great number, to school failure.

4.2.3. Cultural pluralism -- long range policy goal. There is a need for a policy alternative that recognizes cultural difference. The long range goal for policy planners must be the recognition of the legitimacy of cultural difference. Equal educational opportunity will have to be reconceptualized to include differential pedagogical treatment for different ethnic groups to achieve similar goals. An introduction of the cultural pluralism is bound to create controversy and generate a good deal of emotional response. As was indicated earlier the ethnic groups may well object to such discussions of differences as "un-American", racistic and examples of stereotyping. There will also be a tendency to insist that the admission of the validity of other perspectives is an attempt to corrupt the true and right way. It is important to understand that such responses are neither new or unique to the United States. It is also important to recognize that no amount of intellectual reasoning can answer such emotional responses.

4.2.4. Cultural pluralism -- short range policy goals. Although the following are merely half way measures they can be developed at the present time.

A. Curricula can be developed that use cultural phenomenon in the teaching process; for example, the following aspects of black culture could easily be incorporated into curricula and material development:

(1) age-grading -- using slightly older children to teach younger children

(2) music and dance as teaching devices

(3) dialect based readers and teaching standard English with

a contrastive approach

(4) cooperative projects rather than competition

B. Teacher training can be instituted that will allow teachers to acquire special skills and knowledge to work with special ethnic groups. This, of course, goes against the general educational maxim "all children are the same." If one is to teach black culturally different children one must know about the language and culture of the children with whom one is interacting -- otherwise misunderstanding is bound to occur from misinterpretation of a word, a gesture, an intent, etc. The State Department recognizes this. The Foreign Service does not send its officers into countries until they are well versed in the language and culture of that particular country; this is also true of the Peace Corps. There is no reason why this should not also be the case for teachers of minority group children in the United States.

C. Tests can be developed that assess competencies in the vernacular culture as well as the mainstream one.

D. Examination of cultural systems around the world that have dealt with culture-conflict in the process of education.

5.1 Obstacles to the implementation of a culturally based system.

The obstacles to the creation of a culturally based school system have been spelled out several times in the body of this paper (see for example page 20, and the examples of resistance to dialect readers on the pages following). The problems that were discussed in regard to the weakness of the community control model are relevant in that for these same reasons there is likely to be considerable resistance to the notion of the legitimacy of a distinct black culture, especially as regards those aspects of the culture that have not been transvalued by whites, or that have been used in the past as demonstrations of the inferiority of black fold. In addition, to the problems of resistance of the cultural model by members of the ethnic community there is the problem of the school adjusting to change. There are not adequate personnel trained to work within the framework of a cultural difference model (and there are not criteria available as to the certification of such personnel). Nor is there as much information as is necessary to build excellent programs that are able to zero in on the points of conflict between the cultures and build curricula to smoothe the way over these differences. A summary of some of the obstacles is presented below:

1. there is a lack of trained personnel to teach culturally different children,

2. there is no teacher training program set up to train teachers of the culturally different, nor are there state boards that would make such teachers "certifiable."

3. there is a lack of materials and curricula

4. there is a lack of knowledge about the diverse cultural groups in this country, especially as regards microbehaviors that may be very important within the framework of cross-cultural communication--such communication would be vital within a culturally based school system.

5. there is a rejection of the vernacular culture by minority group ethnic members, particularly among the middle class.

6. there is a fear that the recognition of distinct cultural groups in the United States will necessarily be justification for re-segregation.

7. there is a rejection of the cultural relativity thesis, which states that the minority group culture is valid and should be used in the teaching process, by majority group members who are ethnocentric and see only their culture as valuable, real and good -- indeed, to them, the discussion of a valid Negro culture is a threat to the social system.

8. because the issue of culturally related education is bound to generate controversy, and because at the moment failure of black children is a problem -- but in itself not contravertible (no school administrator is being called a racist merely for stating that the black children in his district are not performing near national norms) -- school administrators, one of whose jobs it is to keep controversy at a minimum, may very well opt to do nothing -- or do something that is acceptable even if it is demonstrably ineffective -- rather than risk their jobs for a program that has educational promise but has raised the ire of the NAACP and related organizations.

5.2 Possible plans to implement a culturally based school system.

Given the fact that it is just recently that academics and policy makers are willing to discuss the issue of cultural differences in regard to education in the United States, it should not be surprising that this model is in its infancy in relation to application of current educational problems in this country. Its importance lies not in its offer of an immediate solution, but in the fact that if developed it offers an alternative to the continual cycle of regarding educational problems of minority groups from either an environmental or genetic pathology perspective, and, therefore, offers an alternative to the unsuccessful solutions that have been generated from

hose two models. An historical review of the literature in regard to Negro education in this country will reveal just such a recurring cycle (and indeed, with the disenchantment of the environmentalist solution, we are seeing a swing back to the genetic explanation, with Jensen being the most recent spearhead of such a move).

It is important to understand, however, that the cultural difference hypothesis, which has been recognized in contexts outside the United States, has also been offered to deal with the fialure of minority group children in the past in the United States. Almost on a regular basis of at least once per decade (with the possible exception of the 1960's -- the hey-day of assimilationism) a culture-conflict model of Negro educational problems has been suggested (Woodson 1933, Herskovits 1943, Parks 1950, Stewart 1970). In spite of the apparent plausibil ity of these suggestions they have neither been applied nor refuted; they have, for reasons already suggested, been ignored. NIE with its mandate to find a workable alternative and with a prestige which allows it to encourage substantial (and perhaps unjustifiably controversial) change, has a unique opportunity to test this culture-conflict hypothesis and by so doing perhaps to finally interrupt the history of failure in Negro education.

The following are suggestions of possible steps towards the implementation of a cultural based model into the educational system:

1. Since cultural conflict is not uniques to the United States (and in fact may be the "normal" state of affairs) it has interfered with educational endeavors elsewhere in the world and unlike the American case, it has been a major

factor in educational policy. A first step then, might be to research the field and discover how various educational systems have dealt with this problem, how successful they have been, and what the major difficulties are that they have had.

2. Having done case studies of systems that have confronted the issue of culture-conflict, the next step might be to hold a conference where individuals experienced in and knowledgeable about culturally based school systems would concern themselves with designing a program of implementing a culturally sensitive system of education in terms of the unique demands of the United States situation.

3. Existing programs in the United States might be examined to determine the relationship of these programs to the culture of the children they are attempting to educate.

4. Major universities should be encouraged to begin setting up teacher training programs that would prepare teachers to deal with culturally different children (care must be taken that programs do not merely change their titles from "Preparing Teachers to Teach the Culturally Disadvantaged" to "Preparing Teachers to Teach the Culturally Different). There must be courses of study developed that actually train these teachers to not only respect cultural diversity, but also to learn about the cultures of the children they will teach, and to use that culture in the teaching process.

5. A division in NIE must be created that will be responsible for developing research, basic and applied, into this question of a culturally based school system.

Bibliography

Abrahams, R. The advantages of black English, paper Southern Conference on Language Teaching, 1970.

Bailey, B. Toward a new perspective in Negro English dialectology, American Speech, 40, 1965, 171-177.

Baldwin, A. and Baldwin, C. Adult child interactions in preschool settings, Project Literacy, 9, 1-18, 1968.

Baldwin, A. and Baldwin, C. Cognitive Content of Mother Child Interactions. Final Report Project #6-1341, Grant #OEG 09 6103264480, 1970.

Baratz, J. The acquisition of the plural in economically disadvantaged Negro preschoolers. Unpublished paper. Washington, D.C., ASHA, 1966.

Baratz, J. Language development in the economically disadvantaged child: a perspective. ASHA, 1968.

Baratz, J. Language and cognitive assessment of Negro children: assumptions and research needs. ASHA, 1969.

Baratz, J. Language abilities of black Americans: review of research: 1966 - 1970. In Miller, K. and Dreger (Eds.), in press.

Baratz, J. and Baratz, S. The social pathology model: historical bases for psychology's denial of the existence of Negro culture, APA paper Washington, D.C., 1969. In Kochman (Ed.), in press.

Baratz, S. and Baratz, J. Negro ghetto children and urban education: A cultural solution. Bulletin of the Minnesota Council for the Social Studies, 1968, reprinted in Social Education, 33, 1969, 401-404.

Baratz, S. and Baratz, J. Early childhood intervention: the social science base of institutional racism. Harvard Educational Review, 40, 1970, 29-50.

Bereiter, C. and Engelmann, S. Teaching disadvantaged children in preschool. Engelwood Cliffs, New Jersey. Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Berko, J. The child's learning of English morphology. Word, 1958, 14, 150-177.

Bloom, L. Language Development: form and function in emerging grammars. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1970.

Brown, C. The life and loves of Mr. Jiveass Nigger. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1969.

Brown, H. R. Die Nigger, Die! New York: Dial Press, 1969.

Brown, R. and Fraser, C. The acquisition of syntax. In, Verbal behavior and learning: problems and processes, (ed. Cofer and Musgrave). New York: McGraw Hill, 1963.

Brown, R. Fraser, C. and Bellugi, Explorations in grammar evaluation, In, Cognitive development in children. Five monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970. Reprint, The acquisition of syntax, SRCD Monograph, 1964.

Caldwell, B. The fourth dimension in early childhood education. In R. Hess and R. Bear (Eds.), Early Education: Current Theory, Research and Action. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1968.

Cazden, C. Environmental Assistance to the Child's Acquisition of Grammar, Dissertation, Harvard University, 1964.

Cazden, C., Bryant, and Tillman, Making it and going home: attitudes of black people toward language education. In, Lincolnland Conference on Dialectology, ed. Shriner. Illinois: Eastern Illinois University Press, 1970.

Cole, M. and Bruner, J. Cultural differences and inferences about psychological processes. American Psychologist, 26, 10, 867-876, 1971.

Deutsch, C. Auditory discrimination and learning social factors. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 10, 1964, 277-296.

Dillard, J. L. Nonstandard Negro dialects: Convergence or Divergence? In, Afro-American Anthropology: Current Perspectives, ed., Whitten and Szwed, New York: 119-128.

Dillard, J. L. Black English in the United States. New York: Random House, in press.

Dillard, J. L. The Creolist and the Study of Negro Non-Standard Dialects in the Continental United States. In, Hymes, 1971, pp. 393-408.

Entwisle, D. Subcultural differences in children's language development, International Journal of Psychology, 3, 1968, 13-22.

Entwisle, D. Semantic systems of children. Unpublished paper, Johns Hopkins University, 1969.

Fasold, R. Tense and the form be in Black English. Language, 45, 1969, 763-776.

Garvey, K. and McFarland, A preliminary study of standard English speech patterns in the Baltimore City Public Schools. Johns Hopkins Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, #16, 1968.

Gerber, S. and Hertel, Language deficiencies of disadvantaged children. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 1969, 12, 270-280.

Glazer, N., Commentary, 1971.

Hannerz, U. Soulside: Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community. Stockholm, Sweden: Almquist and Wiksele, 1969.

Henry, J. White people's time, colored people's time. Transaction, March-April, 1965.

Herskovitz, M. J. The Myth of the Negro Past. New York: Harper and Bros., 1941.

Holt, J. Why Children Fail, 1969.

Horner, V. The verbal world of the lower class 3 year old: a pilot study in linguistic ecology. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Rochester, 1968.

Hunt, J. McV. Towards the prevention of incompetence. In J. W. Carter, (Ed.), Research Contributions from Psychology to Community Health. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1968.

Jensen, A. How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? Harvard Educational Review, 39, 1969, 1-123.

Klaus, R. A. and Gray, S. W. The early training project for disadvantaged children: A report after five years. Monograph, SRCD, 33, 1968.

Kochman, T. Black English in the classroom. In, The Functions of Language in the Classroom. Cazden, C., Hymes and John (eds.), New York Teachers College Press, in press.

Labov, W. The social stratification of English in N.Y.C. Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.

Labov, W. Comment on paper by C. T. Scott, 'Transformational theory and English as a second language/dialect. In, School of Languages and Linguistics, Monograph #22, Washington, D.C.,

Labov, W. The logic of nonstandard. In, School of Languages and Linguistics Monograph Series, No. 22, (ed. Alatis), Washington, D.C., Georgetown University, 1969, 1-43.

Labov, W. and Cohen, P. Systematic relations of standard rules in grammar of Negro speakers. Project Literacy, #7, 1967.

Labov, W., Cohen, P., Robbins, C. and Lewis, J. A study of non-standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican speakers in New

York City. Final Report, Cooperative Research Project #3288, Office of Education, Volumes I and II, 1968.

Loflin, M. A note on the deep structure of nonstandard English in Washington, D.C. Glossa, 1, 1967, 26-32.

Loman, B. Conversations in a Negro American Dialect. Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1967.

Malinowski, B. The Pan-African Problem of Culture Contact, In, Education and the Cultural Process, Johnson, C. S. (ed.), reprinted from The American Journal of Sociology, May, 1943.

McDavid, R. American social dialects. College English, 26, 1965, 254-260.

McNeill, D. The acquisition of language: the study of developmental psycholinguistics. New York, Harper and Row, 1970.

Moynihan, D. P. The Negro Family: The Case for National Action. Washington, D.C.: Office of Policy Planning and Research, U.S. Department of Labor, 1965.

Myrdal, G. An American Dilemma. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1944.

Neill, Summerhill, 1967.

Osser, H., Wang, M. and Zaid, F. The young child's ability to imitate and comprehend speech: A comparison of two subcultural groups. Child Development, 4, 1969, 1063-1075.

Philips, S. U. Acquisition of Rules for Appropriate Speech Usage, In, Report of the Twenty-First Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies, Alatis, J. E. (Ed.). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1970.

Salzinger, S., Salzinger, K. and Hobson, J. The effect of syntactic structure on immediate memory for word sequences in middle and lower class children. Journal of Psychology, 67, 1967, 147-159.

Sarason, S. B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Shaefer, E. Tutoring the "disadvantaged." The Washington Post, February 9, 1969.

Shuy, R., Wolfram, W. and Riley, W. Field techniques in an urban language study. Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1968.

Slobin, D. Suggested universals in the ontogenesis of grammar. Working paper #32, Language Behavior Research Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, 1970.

Stewart, W. A. In, Research Planning Conference on Language Development in Disadvantaged Children. New York, Ferkauf Graduate School of Education, 1966.

Stewart, W. A. Sociolinguistic factors in the history of American Negro dialects. Florida Foreign Language Reporter, 1967, 5, 3-18.

Stewart, W. A. Continuity and change in American Negro dialects. Florida Foreign Language Reporter, 1968, 6, 11-26.

Stewart, W. A. Historical and structural bases for the recognition of Negro dialect. In, School of Languages and Linguistics Monograph Series, No. 22 (ed. Alatis). Washington, D.C., Georgetown University, 1969, 239-247.

Stewart, W. A. On the use of Negro dialect in the teaching of reading. In, Teaching Black Children to Read, (ed. Baratz and Shuy). Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Stewart, W. A. Current issues in the use of Negro dialect in beginning reading texts. Florida Foreign Language Reporter, 1970.

Stodolsky, S. and Lesser, G. Learning patterns in the disadvantaged. Harvard Educational Review, 1967, 37, 546-593.

Taylor, D. New languages for old in the West Indies. In, Readings in the Sociology of Language. (ed. Fishman, J.). The Hague, Mouton, 1968, 607-620.

Torrey, J. Understanding the grammar of standard English: a study of children who speak a different dialect. Unpublished paper, 1969.

Ward, C. Them Children. Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, New York, 1971.

Wolfram, W. Black and white speech differences revisited. Detroit speech, 1970.

Young, V. F. Family and childhood in a southern Negro community, American Anthropologist, 27, 2, 1970, 269-285.

Young, V. F. Afro-American Mother-child Relationships, AAA paper, New York, 1971.